

City-wide Critical Sums Analysis Envision Cambridge

McMahon Associates

Prepared for the City of Cambridge

November 15, 2018

Transportation Solutions Building Better Communities

mcmahonassociates.com

City-wide Critical Sums Analysis Methodology

Table of Contents

2
3
3
8
11
12
15
· · ·

Attachments

- A. Critical Sums Subareas & Application to Development Areas
- B. Trip Generation Rates
- C. Existing Mode Share by Subarea
- D. Trip Distributions to Subareas
- E. Trip Distributions to Intersections

Section A: Overview

The City of Cambridge's Critical Sums Analysis (CSA) methodology served as the basis for this analysis. The process is based on methodology previously used by City of Cambridge for the 2001 *Eastern Cambridge Planning Study* (ECaPS), 2001 Citywide Rezoning, and 2005 *Concord-Alewife Plan*, refined in 2011-2012 for the *Kendall Square-Central Square (K2C2) Study*, and used for *the Alewife Critical Sums Analysis* (2017) as part of the Envision Cambridge project. The methodology used in these studies is largely based on the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for calculating critical lane movements (critical sums).

Critical movements are the sum of the northbound left and southbound through/right compared to the southbound left and the northbound through/right. The same is done for the eastbound and westbound intersection approaches. The greater of the northbound/southbound is added to the greater of the eastbound and westbound to calculate the critical sum for the intersection. The highest total of the approaches is the critical sum. The following pages explain the methodology.

Seven intersections were selected in consultation with City staff, with a goal of identifying key intersections within the context of the subareas to reflect impacts of future development. The selected intersections were based on a list of previously analyzed intersections, roadway geometry, and prior work completed as part of the *K2C2* study and *Alewife Critical Sums Analysis*, so as not to duplicate efforts. The seven intersections evaluated for the City-wide Envision Cambridge critical sums analysis are indicated in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Study Area Intersections

Transportation Solutions Building Better Communities mcmahonassociates.com



Section B: Existing Traffic Volumes

Existing PM peak hour traffic volumes for all seven intersections were documented from recent traffic impact statements (TIS) and reports for projects in the study area. The traffic count data source for each intersection is listed in Table 1.

Intersection	Date Counted	Data Source
1. Mass Ave & Albany St	September 4, 2017	MIT Vassar Dorm
2. Sidney St & Putnam Ave	September 13, 2012	240 Sidney St
3. Central Square (Mass Ave &	May 18, 2016	Mass + Main
Prospect St)		
4. Cambridge St & Prospect St	January 26, 2017	Inman Square
	May 10, 2016	Western Ave Post
5. Western Ave & Putnam Ave		Construction
6. Mass Ave & Rindge Ave	May 2016	Mass Ave Study
7. Mass Ave & Upland Rd	2015	Porter Square Study

Table 1: Existing Traffic Volumes Sources

Traffic volumes were adjusted to reflect an average month in spring 2018.¹ A background growth rate of 0.5% was applied based on the number of years needed to bring count data to the year 2018.²

Section C: Critical Lane Movement Calculations

The formulas applied to each intersection are listed below. Intersection #1 Mass Ave at Albany St was calculated based on the existing roadway configuration as well as the proposed configuration in the South Mass Ave Safety Improvements Study.³

³ Plans for preferred alternative intersection configuration at Mass Ave at Albany St sent by City Staff via email on August 7, 2018.



¹ Adjustments based on MassDOT count station H8495 on interstate 93 in Somerville, MA. September data was adjusted upward 2% and January data was adjusted upward 11% to reflect May counts.

² Background growth not applied to Mass Ave at Rindge Ave as ATR station #84 on Concord Avenue from Cambridge website indicates that traffic counts in the vicinity of the area have not increased between 2012 and 2016. Growth rate of 0.5% based on KSURP 10 Report, Kendall Square Critical Sums Analysis and Inman Square Intersection Improvement Project.

Intersection 1: Massachusetts Ave at Albany St [Existing configuration]



Intersection 1: Massachusetts Ave at Albany St [Proposed configuration]



Intersection 2: Sidney St at Putnam Ave



Intersection 3: Central Square – Massachusetts Ave at Prospect St





Transportation Solutions Building Better Communities mcmahonassociates.com

Intersection 4: Cambridge St at Prospect St



Highest Of:

NB: [NBL] + [SBL + T + R] or SB: [SBL] + [NBL + T + R] EB: [EBL] + [WBL + T + R] or

WB: [WBL] + [EBL + T + R]

Intersection 5: Western Ave at Putnam Ave



Intersection 6: Massachusetts Ave at Rindge St



Intersection 7: Massachusetts Ave at Upland Rd





Section D: Trip Generation Rates

The study area was divided into fourteen subareas to evaluate trip generation based on four future land use scenarios. The fourteen subareas are comprised of 33 development areas (see Figure 2) that were defined by the Envision Cambridge project team. The grouping of each development area into the 14 subareas for the critical sums analysis is documented in Attachment A.



Figure 2: Study Area Subareas

Transportation Solutions Building Better Communities mcmahonassociates.com



The net new square footage of each land use type for each scenario was provided by the Envision Cambridge project team for each development area,⁴ and summarized by subarea. Four future scenarios were evaluated:

- 1. Existing Zoning Buildout
- 2. Super-Inclusionary Buildout
- 3. Environmental Performance Buildout
- 4. Hybrid Super-Inclusionary & Environmental Performance Buildout (referred to as "Both")

The scenarios represent buildout to the year 2030, with the percentage buildout varying by study area. Trip generation was determined by applying ITE trip generation rates by land use to the additional square footage of new development by land use type and applying a mode share provided by the City of Cambridge. Methodologies for trip generation and trip distribution were reviewed by City of Cambridge staff through interim updates. The land use by square footage is summarized in Figure 3.⁵



Figure 3: Total Millions of SF by Land Use

⁵ Other land use was excluded from analysis due to low change in square footage, which results in low number of additional trips. Land uses with a decrease in square footage (due to decrease in development) were also excluded from the analysis to provide a conservative approach and not credit a reduction in trips.



⁴ Land use figures for each scenario provided by Utile on September 11, 2018 via email.

General Procedure

• The PM peak period was used for the analysis, as this is the period when traffic volumes tend to be the highest. This also reflects the methodology used in prior City of Cambridge studies where critical sums analysis was used. New trips were generally calculated as follows:



Associated trip generation rates are from the ITE Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition – these
rates were used to calculate trips generated by land use, and are summarized by land use and
ITE Code in Table 2. Attachment B documents the selection of trip generation rates and
alternatives considered.

Land Use	ITE Code	Average Daily Trip Rate (per 1000 SF GFA)	Average AM Trip Rate (per 1000 SF GFA)	Average PM Trip Rate (per 1000 SF
				GFA)
R&D	760	11.26	1.22	1.11
General Office	710	9.74	1.47	1.42
Retail	820	37.75	3.00	4.21
Residential	221	5.44	0.32	0.41
(Per Dwelling Unit)				
Institutional	550	26.04	1.10	1.19

Table 2: ITE Lan	d Use Codes	and Trip Rates
------------------	-------------	----------------



- Square footage by land use and subarea was used to calculate base trips, per the ITE methodology.
- The ITE trips were then converted to person-trips based on a factor of 1.07⁶, provided by the City of Cambridge, based on data from U.S. Census.
- Based on prior direction from the City for other critical sums analyses, an average apartment size of 1,000 SF per dwelling unit was used for calculating residential trips.
- A mode share representing the City's goal for reducing vehicle trips was applied for residential and employee trips.⁷ The mode share goal for future development was based on the mode share target developed as part of the Alewife District Plan Critical Sums Analysis. The following mode shares were applied across all subareas and scenarios:
 - 37% Cambridge employees [Office, R&D, and Institutional land uses]
 - 24% Cambridge residents [Residential land use]

Existing mode shares for each subarea based on Census data were also provided by the City. The mode shares and their application to each subarea are documented in Attachments A and C. The existing mode shares were used for comparison purposes and not input into the analysis.

• A vehicle occupancy factor of 1.1 was then applied to determine the total PM vehicle automobile trips. These vehicle occupancy factors were calculated⁸ based on U.S. Census data.

The total PM vehicle trips were split into arrival and departure trips using the ITE distribution percentages for each land use. They were then categorized into residential and commercial trips based on the generating land use. This analysis was performed for the four future buildout scenarios.

Section E: Trip Distribution

The trip distribution was comprised of two parts: (1) determining the percentage of trips exiting and entering the City along major corridors, and (2) applying those percentages through intersections within the network for each subarea (see Figure 2). This was done for both employee (commercial) and residential trips.

⁸ American Community Survey 2006-2010 U.S. Census data. Residence place information is from CTPP2000 Table 1-002 and 2006- 2010 ACS Table B08301 and workplace information is from CTPP2000 Table 2-002 and 2006-2010 ACS Table B08406.



⁶ National average from the American Community Survey 2005-2009.

⁷ Goal mode shares used in analysis provided by City Staff via email on September 11, 2018

Study Area Trip Distributions

- Trip distributions are based on 2010 U.S. Census data for County to County flows. Flows for the Cambridge workforce are used for employee trips and flows for the Cambridge laborforce are used for residential trips.
- In instances where additional trip distribution data was available, such as traffic impact studies from a development in a subarea, City Parking and Transportation Demand Management (PTDM) Data, or recent critical sums analysis, these sources were used to inform trip distributions. Additional information on trip distribution percentages and data sources are documented in Attachment D.
- Percentages by municipality or origin from the Census data were assigned to the network proportionally based on approximate roadway volumes for that movement, with greater weight on direct access routes to/from a subarea. Access points and percentages for the network are documented in the series of maps provided in Attachment D.
- All streets were considered in the analysis. The streets depicted in the attachments tend to be the most likely travel corridors and generally represent trips going to/coming from the subarea from each major direction. The study area intersections were selected as a snap shot to evaluate the level of traffic increase that may be created by new development in the subarea. Actual traffic increases in the subarea will vary.

Intersection Trip Distributions

- The total number of trips entering and exiting each subarea were dispersed throughout the network to determine the percentage of trips moving through each study intersection, as documented in Attachment E.
- Access points to each study area were reviewed based on probable vehicle paths to and from the study area subareas given the trip distributions and roadway network for each area.
- Local travel routes were identified through a desktop analysis. All streets were considered in the analysis in order to provide a realistic distribution network. This results in a portion of trips not passing through study area intersections.

Section F: Critical Sums Calculation

- The resulting critical sum calculated for each intersection during the PM peak period for the existing condition and the four future scenarios are listed in Table 3 and depicted in Figure 4. The threshold at which operations begin to deteriorate is 1,500 vehicles for typical intersections. Intersections over these thresholds are noted in red. No intersections exceed the threshold with existing traffic volumes, and only one, Cambridge Street at Prospect Street, exceed the threshold under all future scenarios.
- Total volume at each intersection during the PM Peak period was also compared for the existing condition and four future scenarios. Table 4 and Figure 5 show the total volume at each intersection, which increases from the existing condition in all future scenarios.



	Existing Condition (2018)	Existing Zoning (2030°)	Super- Inclusionary (2030)	Environmental Performance (2030)	Both* (2030)
1. Mass Ave & Albany St	1176	1305	1261	1306	1262
2. Sidney & Putnam St	808	999	929	1000	930
3. Central Square	909	1098	1056	1101	1059
4. Cambridge St & Prospect St	1172	1719	1664	1721	1667
5. Western Ave & Putnam	1065	1218	1173	1219	1174
6. Mass Ave & Rindge Ave	1219	1377	1378	1381	1382
7. Mass Ave & Upland Rd	1000	1059	1061	1060	1062

Table 3: PM Peak Hour Critical Sums Analysis Results

*Both is a hybrid of Super-Inclusionary & Environmental Performance buildout scenarios

Red = over critical sums threshold of 1,500 vehicles per hour



Figure 4: PM Peak Hour Critical Sums by Intersection

⁹ For all 2030 buildout scenarios the buildout percentage varies by development area. Percentages are documented as part of the Envision Cambridge process.



	Existing Condition (2018)	Existing Zoning (2030 ¹⁰)	Super- Inclusionary (2030)	Environmental Performance (2030)	Both* (2030)
1. Mass Ave & Albany					
St	1907	2149	2040	2150	2042
2. Sidney & Putnam					
St	821	1022	947	1023	948
3. Central Square	1935	2328	2240	2333	2246
4. Cambridge St &					
Prospect St	1708	2454	2391	2457	2394
5. Western Ave &					
Putnam	1574	1784	1721	1786	1723
6. Mass Ave & Rindge					
Ave	2147	2386	2387	2393	2394
7. Mass Ave &					
Upland Rd	1480	1594	1595	1598	1599

Table 4: PM Peak Hour Total Volume

*Both is a hybrid of Super-Inclusionary & Environmental Performance buildout scenarios



Figure 6: PM Peak Hour Total Volume

¹⁰ For all 2030 buildout scenarios the buildout percentage varies by development area. Percentages are documented as part of the Envision Cambridge process.



Section G: Conclusion

- No intersections exceed the critical sums threshold with existing traffic volumes, and only one, Cambridge Street at Prospect Street, exceeds the threshold under all future buildout scenarios.
- The relatively large increase in critical sum and total volume at the Cambridge Street and Prospect Street intersection is due to the high concentration of development in the Kendall Square and East Cambridge subareas. Compared to other study area intersections, traffic flows at this intersection are most influenced by development in these subareas.
 - The majority of development in both of these subareas is already planned or permitted, or part of the "development pipeline." This means the projected new development as part of each scenario has a relatively low impact on the total volume and critical sum.
 - The net new increase in projected development based on each scenario has little impact overall on PM peak period critical sums at study area intersections.
- The Alewife subarea also has a large portion of new development relative to other subareas; however, the majority of trips to/from this area do not pass through study area intersections (see critical sums analysis for the Alewife District Plan).
- The critical sums analysis reflects the City's future mode share goal. If mode shares are able to be further reduced in the East Cambridge and Kendall Square areas, this presents an opportunity to reduce the critical sum at Cambridge and Prospect Street. With planned transportation enhancements adjacent to these areas, such as the Greenline Extension, reconstruction of Lechmere Station, Inman Square Intersection Safety Improvements Project, and Grand Junction path connection, further reductions in mode share can be realized to reduce the number of vehicle trips in the peak hour traveling through Cambridge Street and Prospect Street.

Critical Sums Sub Areas & Application to Development Areas

Durnasa	Critical Sums Subarea - Trip	Development Subarea - Net New SF by	Development Area - Mode Share		
Purpose.	Distribution & Generation	Land Use		Notes	
Source:	McMahon	Utile	Cambridge		
	1. Cambridgeport/Riverfront	Cambridgeport/Riverfront	Cambridgeport Riverfront		
	2 Cambridgeport/MIT	Cambridgeport/MIT	Cambridgeport MIT	Took average of two mode	- McMahon grouped 33 development areas provided by Utile
	2. Cambridgeport/With	Cambridgeport South	Cambridgeport South	shares	(column C) into 14 subareas (column B) for the critical sums
		Mass Ave Central	Central Square		analysis. This grouping was used for trip distribution and is based
	3 Central Square	Mass Ave Hancock/Putnam			on the development areas' proximity to each other and
	5. central square	Mass Ave Inman/Hancock			surrounding road network determining how trips would
		Mass Ave Pearl			enter/exit each area.
		Mass Ave Mass/Main			
	4. MIT/Osborn	Mass Ave MIT			- To evaluate development scenarios, the development figures
		Osborn	MIT Osborn		provided by Utile (identified via labels in column C) were
	5. Charles Street	Charles Street	Charles St		trip generation portion of the critical sums analysis
		Cambridge St East Cambridge			tip generation portion of the childar suns analysis.
					- The Star Market subarea was not included due to its location far
	6 East Cambridge	Cambridge St East Cambridge Riverfront		Took average of three mode	from study area intersections and low net new square footage.
	0. Last cambridge	Gore Street	Gore St	shares	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		Lechmere West	Lechmere Sq. West		- Mode shares at the census tract level for labor force and
		North Point	North Point		workforce were provided by the City of Cambridge by
	7. Prospect Street	Prospect Street	Prospect St		development area (identified in column D) and applied to the
		Cambridge Street Inman Square			appropriate sub area (column B) based on geographic location, as
					listed in the table. After reviewing results from an initial analysis
	8. Inman Square	Cambridge Street Prospect-Medeiros			with these mode shares, the City adopted a future goal mode
		Inman East			share to use in the analysis, and those listed here were not used.
		Inman East B	Inman Sq. East B		The application of work face and labor force made shares to
	9. Mid Cambridge	Cambridge Street MidCambridge	Cambridge St		- The application of work foce and labor force mode shares to
	10 Hanvard	Harvard - Brattle	Harvard/Brattle Squares		each sub-area is depicted in the attached series of maps.
	10. Haivaid	Mass Ave Harvard			
	11 Lower Mass Ave	Mass Ave Lower Mass	North Mass Ave (HARPO)		
	11. LOWER Mass Ave	Mass Ave Lower Mass Porter			
	12 Mass Ave North	Mass Ave North mass Ave	North Mass Ave (north)		
-	12. Mass Ave North	Mass Ave Porter			
-	13. Alewife	Alewife	*N/A		*Subarea added after initial analysis with current mode
		Kendall Square Core			shares completed
		B South	*N/A		
	14. Kendally Volpe	Volpe			
-		First Street			
			South Mass Ave	Not applied - Central Sq. to Memor	rial Drive
			Star Market	Not evaluating this subarea	
			Citywide	Not applied	

The following trip generation rates in Table 1 were proposed for the Envision Cambridge Critical Sums Analysis. Several factors were considered:

- The trip generation rates used for the 2017 Alewife Critical Sums Analysis are updated from the *ITE Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition* to the *ITE Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition*.
- The 10th edition provides a new option to analyze a land use code based on a "Dense Multi-Use Urban" environment. This environment may be appropriate for Cambridge, but it is only available for general office and residential land uses (as seen in Table 2). Because of this, the "General Urban/Suburban" category was used to remain consistent with previous critical sums analyses and apply the same type of trip rate across all land uses.
 - As trip rates are generally lower for "Dense Multi-Use Urban" this results in a conservative approach to the analysis.
- The 10th edition provides a new option to use a person trip rate (vs. a vehicle trip rate that is used in previous editions). The person trip rate results in a higher trip generation rate per day/peak hour, and is not available for R&D and industrial land uses (as seen in Table 3). To remain consistent with previous critical sums analysis and apply the same type of trip rate for all land uses, the vehicle trip rate was used and a person trip factor will be applied as was done in previous critical sums analyses.
- The peak hour of generator was used for all land uses to remain consistent with 9th Edition methodology and previous critical sums analyses.

Land Use	ITE Code	Average Daily Trip Rate	Average AM Trip Rate	Average PM Trip
			(per 1000 SE GEA)	Rate (ner 1000 SE
		(per 1000 SF GFA)		
				GFA)
	700	44.95	4.00	
R&D	760	11.26	1.22	1.11
General Office	710	9.74	1.47	1.42
Industrial ¹	130	3.37	0.41	0.40
Retail	820	37.75	3.00	4.21
Residential ²	221	5.44	0.32	0.41
(Per Dwelling Unit)				
(i ci Dweinig onit)				
Institutional ³	550 ⁴	26.04	1.10	1.19

Table 1: Proposed ITE Trip Rates by Land Use (General Urban/Suburban Environment)

1 Assumes Industrial Park

2 Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) LUC used to reflect Cambridge environment

3 Includes class rooms, offices, or research space

4 "University/College" LUC used

Table 2: Proposed ITE Trip Rates for General Urban/Suburban Environment (black) comparedwith Trip Rates for Dense Multi-Use Urban Environment (red)

Land Use	ITE Code	Average Daily Trip Rate	Average AM Trip Rate	Average PM Trip
			(per 1000 SF GFA)	Rate (per 1000 SF
		(per 1000 SF GFA)		GFA)
R&D	760	11.26	1.22	1.11
General Office	710	9.74 (N/A)	1.47 <mark>(.91)</mark>	1.42 <mark>(.87)</mark>
Industrial ¹	130	3.37	0.41	0.40
Retail	820	37.75	3.00	4.21
Residential ²	221	5.44 <mark>(2.59)</mark>	0.32 (.15)	0.41 <mark>(.18)</mark>
(Per Dwelling Unit)				
Institutional ³	550 ⁴	26.04	1.10	1.19

1 Assumes Industrial Park

2 Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) LUC used to reflect Cambridge environment

3 Includes class rooms, offices, or research space

4 "University/College" LUC used

Table 3: ITE Person Trip Rates for General Urban/Suburban Environment (black) compared withTrip Rates for Dense Multi-Use Urban Environment (red)

Land Use	ITE Code	Average Daily Trip Rate	Average AM Trip Rate	Average PM Trip
			(per 1000 SF GFA)	Rate (per 1000 SF
		(per 1000 SF GFA)		GFA)
R&D	760	N/A	N/A	N/A
General Office	710	14.87 <mark>(13.68)</mark>	1.49 (1.44)	1.56 <mark>(1.46)</mark>
Industrial ¹	130	N/A	N/A	N/A
Retail	820	N/A	5.03	7.49
Residential ²	221	N/A	0.32 (.59)	0.50 <mark>(.62)</mark>
(Per Dwelling Unit)				
Institutional ³	550 ⁴	N/A	2.27	2.37

1 Assumes Industrial Park

2 Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) LUC used to reflect Cambridge environment

3 Includes class rooms, offices, or research space

4 "University/College" LUC used

Journey to Work Modes: Cambridge Laborforce

	Critical Sums	Drove		Public				Work at	
Development Area	intersection	Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk	Other	Home	Total
Cambridge St	1	19%	3%	6%	20%	41%	0%	10%	100%
Cambridgeport MIT	3	22%	2%	10%	27%	32%	2%	5%	100%
Cambridgeport Riverfront	7	20%	6%	5%	38%	22%	2%	7%	100%
Cambridgeport South	3	32%	4%	12%	27%	16%	2%	7%	100%
Central Square	4	24%	1%	9%	41%	17%	1%	8%	100%
Charles St	-	19%	5%	2%	34%	34%	1%	5%	100%
Gore St	1	22%	2%	8%	39%	24%	1%	4%	100%
Harvard/Brattle Squares	8	13%	2%	5%	23%	49%	1%	7%	100%
Inman Sq East B	6	35%	3%	11%	24%	20%	1%	6%	100%
Lechmere Sq West	1	39%	6%	2%	28%	17%	1%	6%	100%
MIT Osborn	2	16%	1%	5%	34%	36%	0%	7%	100%
North Mass Ave (HARPO)	10	24%	4%	5%	24%	34%	1%	8%	100%
North Mass Ave (north)	9	37%	3%	5%	40%	8%	1%	6%	100%
North Point	1 +/-	39%	6%	2%	28%	17%	1%	6%	100%
Prospect St	5	28%	3%	11%	33%	17%	1%	8%	100%
South Mass Ave	2-4	21%	2%	7%	33%	27%	0%	9%	100%
Star Market	-	53%	7%	10%	20%	7%	1%	2%	100%
Citywide	-	28%	3%	7%	29%	25%	1%	7%	100%

Source:

American Community Survey 2012 - 2016 Five Year Estimates,

https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/16_5YR/B08301/140000US25017352101 | 140000US25017352102 | 140000US25017352102 | 140000US25017352102 | 140000US25017352100 | 140000US25017352300 | 140000US25017352400 | 140000US25017352500 | 140000US25017352600 | 140000US25017353102 | 140000US25017353102 | 140000US25017353102 | 140000US25017353102 | 140000US25017353100 | 140000US25017353100 | 140000US25017353600 | 140000US25017354000 |

Journey to Work Modes: Cambridge Workforce

	Critical Sums	Drove		Public				Work at	
Development Area	intersection	Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk	Other	Home	Total
Cambridge St	1	45%	8%	29%	3%	11%	1%	2%	100%
Cambridgeport MIT	3	57%	14%	13%	3%	8%	0%	5%	100%
Cambridgeport Riverfront	7	64%	6%	16%	4%	6%	0%	4%	100%
Cambridgeport South	3	43%	3%	12%	1%	5%	4%	30%	100%
Central Square	4	44%	7%	28%	4%	13%	0%	4%	100%
Charles St	-	56%	8%	22%	3%	8%	2%	1%	100%
Gore St	1	41%	5%	14%	13%	17%	0%	10%	100%
Harvard/Brattle Squares	8	33%	8%	31%	5%	19%	0%	3%	100%
Inman Sq East B	6	60%	7%	14%	3%	12%	1%	5%	100%
Lechmere Sq West	1	62%	3%	2%	2%	3%	6%	22%	100%
MIT Osborn	2	51%	9%	26%	4%	8%	1%	1%	100%
North Mass Ave (HARPO)	10	30%	7%	27%	5%	26%	1%	4%	100%
North Mass Ave (north)	9	61%	5%	15%	0%	10%	1%	8%	100%
North Point	1 +/-	62%	3%	2%	2%	3%	6%	22%	100%
Prospect St	5	50%	6%	23%	4%	13%	0%	4%	100%
South Mass Ave	2-4	44%	8%	29%	4%	12%	1%	2%	100%
Star Market	-	53%	4%	19%	1%	7%	3%	13%	100%
Citywide	-	45%	8%	26%	4%	13%	1%	3%	100%

Source:

2006 - 2010 Central Transportaion Planning Products (CTPP) File

https://ctpp.transportation.org/ctpp-data-set-information/5-year-data/













Attachment C

















Envision Cambridge City Wide Critical Sums Trip Distribution

Overview

This technical memo provides an overview of the methodology used to create the trip distributions for residential and employee land uses.

Employee Distributions

- Based on 2010 U.S. Census data for County to County flows for the Cambridge workforce. This data documents the place a residents for workers in Cambridge, city-wide (except where further information was available see assumptions heading).
- The top 25 results were used to compile a regional trip distribution to/from Cambridge. The results were grouped into regions and with a total percent of trips for each, as seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Cambridge Worker Flows, U.S. Census 2010			
Region to/from	Percent of Total Trips		
Cambridge	30%		
Somerville	11%		
Arlington	5%		
WWNB (Watertown, Waltham, Newton,			
Brookline)	10%		
Boston	19%		
NE (east of I-93)	14%		
NW (pie slice from West corridor to I-93)	8%		
West (Convenient to Turnpike and			
Worcester line)	1%		
SW (pie slice from West corridor to			
Route 24)	0%		
SE (East of Route 24)	2%		



Residential Distributions

- Based on 2010 U.S. Census data for County to County flows for the Cambridge labor force (except where further information was available see assumptions heading). This data documents the place of work for residents of Cambridge, city-wide
- The top 25 results were used to compile a regional trip distribution to/from Cambridge. The results were grouped into regions and with a total percent of trips for each, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Cambridge Resident Flows, U.S. Census 2010		
Region to/from	Percent of Total Trips	
Cambridge	49%	
Somerville	2%	
Arlington	1%	
WWNB (Watertown, Waltham, Newton,		
Brookline)	7%	
Boston	32%	
NE (east of I-93)	2%	
NW (pie slice from West corridor to I-93)	4%	
West (Convenient to Turnpike and		
Worcester line)	2%	
SW (pie slice from West corridor to		
Route 24)	0%	
SE (East of Route 24)	1%	

The employee and residential trip distributions by region are provided in Attachment A.

Additional Assumptions

- In the conference call 8/6/18 it was decided to use 2010 census data county to county flows to inform trip distribution patterns for all subarea, unless additional data is available.
 - It was decided not to use city-wide PTDM data for all subareas because of its geographical bias towards Kendall Square. It was decided to use PTDM data for Kendall Square only Kendall Square. This was used to inform trip distribution in the Charles Street subarea.
 - Other additional sources include trip distribution from relevant Traffic Impact Studies.
- The Alewife and Kendall/Volpe subareas were added to the critical sums analysis based on a conference call on September 11, 2018. The trip distributions were determined as a composite of subarea trip distributions from recent critical sums analyses in these areas.



- The Alewife trip distributions combined those of the five subareas from the Alewife District Plan.
- The Kendall Square/Volpe trip distributions combined trip distributions for subareas 2,
 3, and 4 that match the boundaries of the current Kendall/Volpe subarea.
- The K2C2 analysis was completed prior to the installation of the third street connector; however, this additional connection does not impact trip distribution as it is internal to the subarea.
- The sources of trip distribution for all subareas are listed in Table 2.

Subarea	Trip Distribution Source	Trip Distribution Source
	Residential	Commercial
North Mass Ave	Census Data	Census Data
Lower Mass Ave	Census Data	Census Data
Harvard Square	Census Data	Smith Campus Center TIS
Mid Cambridge	Census Data	Census Data
Inman Square	Census Data	Census Data
Prospect Street	Census Data	Census Data
East Cambridge	Census Data	Census Data
Kendall Square	PTDM Data	PTDM Data
MIT/Osbourne Triangle	Mass + Main TIS	Mass + Main TIS
Central Square	Census Data	Census Data
Cambridgeport/MIT	240 Sidney St TIS	Census Data
Cambridgeport Riverfront	Census Data	Census Data
Alewife	Alewife District Plan Critical	Alewife District Plan Critical
	Sums Analysis (Dec 2017)	Sums Analysis (Dec 2017)
Kendall/Volpe	K2C2 Critical Sums Analysis (June 2012)	K2C2 Critical Sums Analysis (June 2012)

Table 3: Trip Distribution Sources by Subarea

Subarea Distribution

- Access points were determined city-wide based on probable vehicle paths to and from all subareas along major roadways, as seen in Attachment B.
- Percentages by municipality or origin from the census data were assigned to the network proportionally based on approximate roadway volumes for that movement, with greater weight on direct access routes to/from a subarea.


- Access points and percentages for the network are documented in Attachments C and D. All streets were considered in the analysis. The streets depicted in the attachments tend to be the most likely travel corridors and generally represent trips going to/coming from the subarea from each major direction.
- The study area intersections were selected as a snap shot to evaluate the level of traffic increase that may be created by new development in the subarea. Actual traffic increases in the subarea will vary.





Data source: 2010 US Census Top 25 County to County Flows to/from Cambridge, MA



Data source: 2010 U.S. Census Top 25 County to County Work Flows to/from Cambridge, MA
















































































































































