



**ROUTE 133  
CORRIDOR (LOWELL  
STREET)  
Q & A**

**October 14, 2020**

# INTERSECTION TRAFFIC OPERATIONS – QUESTIONS

1. Will the lights for the Eastbound and Westbound lanes of 133 operate independently? - Francesca Maddaluno
2. Will they still be allowed to cross traffic and turn left at the lights? - Francesca Maddaluno
3. The lane assignment from 133 westbound at the intersection is silly. Should be right and straight through in one lane and (waiting) left in the other. - Kevin Coffey
4. Don't you already know how many cars are turning to Poor St.??? - Kevin Coffey
5. Do you not already have detailed traffic/turn data??? You can do NOTHING without that! - Kevin Coffey
6. You seem not to already have the traffic data for the biggest left/right lane resident concerns!! - Kevin Coffey
7. So, if you already have turning movement, traffic, and pedestrian data, why can you not already say how the traffic right-exclusive vs. left-exclusive lanes should be allocated??? - Kevin Coffey

# INTERSECTION TRAFFIC OPERATIONS – QUESTIONS CONTINUED

1. Separate waiting left, not clear right! - Kevin Coffey
2. we think a Left turn lane from Lowell St. onto Rt 28 is very important - Sarah Gaden
3. To clarify my last comment, we are especially concerned with Lowell Street eastbound turning onto 28 north. - Sarah Gaden
4. Why isn't there a right-on-red allowed from Rt133 heading West onto Rt 28? Can that be fixed? - Carolyn Dann
5. Can't you coordinate the Right turn option with the pedestrian light? If you have a separate right turn light that only turns green when no pedestrians are crossing that should work. - Carolyn Dann
6. Number one need is a dedicated left turn lane from Lowell St. heading east to Rt. 28 heading north. - Andrew Malis
7. You have probably heard from a lot of people on this, but put me firmly in the camp that says on 133 Eastbound at Shawsheen plaza, we need a left turn only lane, not a right turn only lane. Left turners are the problem. - Nicholas Stellakis
8. How are the final decisions made with regards to what option you go with? - Mathew McLean

# **INTERSECTION TRAFFIC OPERATIONS - RESPONSE**

The project is still in the data collection and analysis stage. Part of the data collection involves listening to the neighborhood and daily users of the Lowell Street corridor. Traffic data collected prior to the March 10, 2020 state of emergency declaration will be used to identify the best turn-lane assignments and signal phasing that safely minimizes overall intersection backups. The comments and questions in this section, mostly about left-turn concerns, emphasize the driver frustration with the existing conditions and suggest a starting point for identifying lane assignments. The analysis results and recommended lane assignments and vehicular/pedestrian signal phasing will be further discussed at the next public outreach meeting.

# INTERSECTION GEOMETRY - QUESTIONS

1. Will Reservation Road travellers still be allowed to make a left turn on to Shawsheen RD? They quite often block traffic and travellers on Lowell St cannot see them when making a turn on to Shawsheen RD. - Francesca Maddaluno
2. (I have been behind someone sitting trying to make a left turn off Reservation RD to Shawsheen RD for over 15 minutes during traffic hours- perhaps prohibiting left turns off Reservation RD during certain hours.) - Francesca Maddaluno
3. Reservation Road is a traffic hazard - Francesca Maddaluno
4. How would you make a left turn on to Poor Street from 133 in that scenario? - Francesca Maddaluno
5. The question was for Lowell St onto Poor. The second picture does not allow you to turn on to it - Francesca Maddaluno
6. At West Parish intersection, heading from 133 onto Beacon St, separate lane feels riskier than a turn lane because it is difficult to look backwards enough to see oncoming cars from Shawsheen St. - Carolyn Dann
7. At the West Parish end, are you considering how to connect Reservation Road to that intersection? It is a bit complicated now. - Carolyn Dann
8. Years ago, I once took my daughter across this intersection, using the walk light. But, the crossing space was in the middle of the line of cars and one car was confused enough that they tried to back up and nearly ran over us. That was my last attempt! - Carolyn Dann
9. 133/28 intersection; heading east on 133, left turn cross paths with right turn on poor st heading west, how handle? - david lewis

## **INTERSECTION GEOMETRY - RESPONSE**

The modified intersection geometry at both intersections aims to improve safety for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. This can be achieved by better aligning approaches and departures from the intersection, eliminating ambiguity from vehicle movements at the intersections, reducing conflict points, and providing shorter crosswalks. The intersection geometry will also depend on the selected traffic signal phasing and presence of turn-lanes at the intersections. The suggested alignment modifications to Reservation Road and Poor Street will aim to improve safety and operations. The recommended alternative for each intersection will be discussed at the next public outreach meeting.

# **POTENTIAL ROUNDAABOUT - QUESTIONS**

- 1. Hello. Clint Palermo/Mujde Yuksel here at 7 Lowell Street. Has any consideration been given to the possibility of a rotary/traffic circle at the Shawsheen intersection? That's seems like it might be a more optimal solution. - Mujde Yuksel**
- 2. Have you considered rotaries / roundabouts to deal with traffic and speed? - Peter Andrews**

# **POTENTIAL ROUNDABOUT - RESPONSE**

The preliminary design process at both intersections will evaluate a roundabout alternative in consideration of prior studies and as required by MassDOT as part of the preliminary design development. Our initial investigation of roundabout alternatives suggests that both intersections are too constrained by the right of way and other critical features (e.g. historic, environmental) to provide the necessary size roundabout for acceptable operations and accommodation of large vehicles.



# **PROJECT LIMITATIONS - QUESTIONS**

- 1. Who defined that the project would stop at West Parish? - Kevin Coffey**
- 2. What are the limits of work on Main St.? - Ann Knowles**
- 3. Can there be consideration of bike lanes on Main St.? - Ann Knowles**
- 4. What are the project limits on Beacon Street? Does the project extend to High Plain Rd? - Jim Delaney**
- 5. Can you do anything about the bike lane disappearing on Rt 133 travelling east from Rt 28. It feels risky as a cyclist to have no bike lane right at the intersection although it does reappear before York St. - Carolyn Dann**

# **PROJECT LIMITATIONS - RESPONSE**

The limits of the current project along Lowell Street are from the Beacon Street/Shawsheen Road intersection to the North Main Street (Route 28) intersection (Shawsheen Square). The improvements along the approach roadways to each signalized intersection extend approximately 100 feet to 300 feet from the intersection. The original project limits extended approximately 1-mile further west on Route 133, to the Lovejoy Road/Greenwood Road intersection. Phasing the project was suggested by MassDOT after the project's initial approval by MassDOT's Project Review Committee in 2016 due to the difficulty with programming funding for such a large project.

# CORRIDOR SCOPE - QUESTIONS

1. I walk Lowell Street regularly (mostly from Canterbury St. to Crack'd/IRS. There is sidewalk the whole way! The sidewalks (and tree/bush trimming) need work. - Kevin Coffey
2. Why are sidewalk needed on both sides? There are controlled crosswalks? There is not width for sidewalks on both sides, bike lanes, and everything else! - Kevin Coffey
3. Why are sidewalks needed on both sides? Cross the street (at a controlled intersection)! - Kevin Coffey
4. Shared-use bike/pedestrian is horrible! - Kevin Coffey
5. A two-foot grass strip is useless! It takes space, contributes little, and requires maintenance. - Kevin Coffey
6. Bikes and walkers, often two or three walkers together or walkers with dogs on leashes, just don't go together! - Kevin Coffey
7. Forget "shared-use"path. Better would be to put bikes on one side and pedestrians on the other, each with a dedicated path. - Kevin Coffey

# CORRIDOR SCOPE - QUESTIONS

1. You guys are delusional if you believe that this corridor can be both safe and convenient for so much and so many kinds of traffic. Tough, but priority decisions must be made explicit. - Kevin Coffey
2. So with a shared use path, would experienced cyclists end up back in the road? - Carolyn Dann
3. Ask near neighbors and avid cyclists, we have a **STRONG** preference for separate bicycle lanes instead of shared use sidewalks. We've had loads of bad experiences with strollers, dogs, walkers, etc travelling a very different speeds compared to bikes. - Carolyn Dann
4. where does the shared use path terminate? would the path go across the intersections (i.e. to the west parish cemetery and to the bowling green) ? - Jim Delaney
5. Has there been consideration for an upgraded sidewalk with bike lane for the north side with only a bike lane created for the south side (no sidewalk)? This would accommodate walking traffic for the 1.25 mile as well as bike traffic. - Barbara Longworth
6. Have you considered how narrowing of roadway will impact idling trash collection trucks, USPS, UPS, etc? See this as a potential traffic headache. - Michael Coyne
7. It seems that bike lanes are being considered necessary. However, these bike lanes would actually cause more risk not only to bikers, but to pedestrians as well. Why are bike lanes part of this project? Automotive traffic and pedestrian safety is paramount - Steven Cavazza

# **CORRIDOR SCOPE - RESPONSE**

To be eligible for project funding through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the corridor must meet MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Policy and supporting Engineering Directives, which require bi-directional bicycle accommodations and sidewalks on both sides of the roadway in urbanized areas. For higher volume and higher speed roadways, the bicycle accommodations must be separated from the vehicle lanes. A 10-foot wide shared-use path on one side of the road can accommodate pedestrians and bicycle travel in both directions. Bicycle accommodations along the corridor would terminate at the intersections.

## **BUSINESSES - QUESTIONS**

- 1. Will you preserve the parking spaces on Rt 133 in front of the businesses? - cynthia richard**
- 2. How will you protect access to the businesses on lowell/ poor street? - cynthia richard**
- 3. Will you be able to create alternative parking for the shops at Shawsheen Village so they can get off Rt 133? - Carolyn Dann 33?**

## **BUSINESSES - RESPONSE**

The proposed improvements will aim to maintain parking near businesses at Shawsheen Square and seek opportunities to increase parking capacity. The construction of accessible sidewalks and safe biking facilities will afford opportunities for walking and biking from nearby neighborhoods to the local businesses. Additionally, the improvements will aim to enhance the Shawsheen Square aesthetics to be a more inviting atmosphere.

## **UTILITIES - QUESTIONS**

- 1. What happens to power lines? -  
Jacqueline Salit**
- 2. Lowell Street power lines are missing  
from preliminary design drawings. -  
Jacqueline Salit**
- 3. What happened to power lines/utility  
poles? Are they being buried  
underground? - Francesca Maddaluno**
- 4. Will utility poles be relocated?  
Utilities be put underground? -  
Michael Coyne**
- 5. The plans seem to indicate that the  
electric wires will be buried - is this  
the case? - Christa Elliott**



## **UTILITIES - RESPONSE**

**Several utility poles will be relocated as part of the proposed improvements. The overhead utilities are not proposed to be buried as part of this project.**

# CROSS SECTION WIDTH & PROPERTY IMPACTS - QUESTIONS

1. What top-level goals even started this project? Lowell Street is a very narrow corridor for the amount of traffic that tends to use it. Can the fundamental width really change? - Kevin Coffey
2. How much must the road be widened in order to have Mass DOT-required sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes on both sides? - Kevin Coffey
3. Could you please identify where the concept designs would require right of way beyond the rights of way already in place? - Kevin Coffey
4. Shared bike and pedestrian is a disaster, with no clear right of way/priority between them. - Kevin Coffey
5. How much extra space is needed for the sidewalk and bike lane on the south side of Lowell St? Same question for if the design is for a shared path? - Barbara Longworth
6. For those who live on Lowell St on the south side, the encroachment into property appears to be sizeable. How will you accommodate this while impacting property fronts many of which have stone walls, hills, etc - Barbara Longworth
7. Is the impact of 10-15' on both sides? - Carolyn Dann
8. I understand that you are in preliminary design, but as an abutter living on Lowell St on the North side, it would be nice to know what changes may happen to our property - Sarah Gaden
9. Hi, thanks for putting this together. As a direct abutter I was curious about how much land you would be using on either side of rt 133. We are concerned about losing parking spaces in our driveway. Would you be purchasing land from abutters? - Ian Campbell
10. Are there any scenarios that eminent domain will come into play? - Susan Cook
11. Are there GIS maps that depict the town's right of way/land that can potentially be used for road expansions? - George Nugent

# **CROSS SECTION WIDTH & PROPERTY IMPACTS - RESPONSE**

The existing roadway pavement is approximately 30 feet wide. If the roadway width is reduced slightly and a sidewalk and shared-use path are added with grass buffers, then the new total width from back of sidewalk to back of shared-use path would be approximately 46 to 48 feet. The recommended roadway alignment will depend on the existing features/constraints along the corridor and aim to limit environmental and property impacts. In more severely constrained sections, the grass buffers could potentially be reduced or eliminated. The Town-owned right of way along the corridor is generally 50-feet wide.

# **VEHICLE SPEED - QUESTIONS**

- 1. What is the plan to slow down traffic? - Jamie Laflamme**
- 2. That's because you checked pre-Covid since Covid it's been a real issue. - Jamie Laflamme**
- 3. Will another speed study be done between now and the next phase? - Jamie Laflamme**
- 4. Would speeds be reduced? - Jamie Laflamme**
- 5. Are raised crosswalks being considered to slow traffic? The intersection/crosswalk at Chandler St is problematic. - Mike Griffin**
- 6. How about raised crosswalks for slowing traffic? - George Nugent**
- 7. Are we allowed to change the speed limit for a state highway? Shawsheen RD has a very high speed limit and we were told that the state determines the speed limit. - Francesca Maddaluno**
- 8. There was a brief time when a speed sign was on Loweel St. and on many occasions it flashed numbers like 40 and 50 MPH. this will not improve with some options being dicussed here. - Steven Cavazza**
- 9. Speed enforcement on Lowell St. would help a lot with safety. It should NOT be a goal to make Lowell St. an attractive cutoff between I-93 and I-495. - Kevin Coffey**

## **VEHICLE SPEED - RESPONSE**

Reducing the roadway and travel lane widths can be implemented to encourage slower vehicle speeds along the corridor. Design guidelines advise against speed humps or raised crosswalks on high-volume roadways such as Route 133. Cutting back slopes and vegetation that reduce sight distances at intersecting streets will provide more time for turning vehicles to find safe gaps in traffic.

# **AESTHETICS & ENVIRONMENT - QUESTIONS**

1. Agreed, amenities that make the Wood Park more obviously open on all sides and more clearly welcoming to the public would be a good investment. - Carolyn Dann
2. In Paul's intro he mentioned better "connection" to Downtown. How would that look? What would that involve? - Carolyn Dann
3. How many trees would need to be removed to enable sidewalks on both sides and bike lanes? - Carolyn Dann
4. For noise and quality of life has restricting evening commercial traffic been a consideration for this project? - George Nugent
5. The shared use path is more aesthetically pleasing than the double bike paths--in my opinion. - Mathew McLean
6. Will any tree removal be seriously considered with green house gas emission taken into consideration? - Jacqueline Salit
7. Who is going to sit on a bench looking at Lowell St. or Shawsheen intersection? Get real! - Kevin Coffey

## **AESTHETICS & ENVIRONMENT - RESPONSE**

Several existing trees are expected to be impacted along the corridor. We are working with a landscape architect to identify measures to maintain corridor aesthetics and enhance the intersections. The goal of the Shawsheen Square intersection will be to create a place that is inviting and walkable, similar to Andover's downtown.

# STREET LIGHTING - QUESTIONS

1. are lights on both sides of the road going to be added? - Ian Campbell
2. Just a thought: Regarding lighting, I think it would be beneficial to start considering lighting that is "dark sky" friendly. Many communities are moving in that direction to reduce light pollution and allow for residents to see more of the sky/stars. <https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/lighting-basics/> - Mathew McLean



## **STREET LIGHTING - RESPONSE**

**Additional corridor-wide street lighting is not currently proposed as part of this project, as it would likely not be eligible for State and Federal funding. The existing streetlights mounted to existing utility poles will be maintained, and proposed crosswalk locations will be evaluated to ensure adequate lighting is provided for pedestrian safety.**

# PROJECT FUNDING & STATUS - QUESTIONS

1. Should we do this at all, assuming always-finite resources and other real needs like accelerating water main replacements? - Kevin Coffey
2. Who is paying these consultants--to town or state? - Kevin Coffey
3. Is there an option to forget it--make easy" improvements to the intersections and leave most of the route unchanged? - Kevin Coffey
4. Great. Gas main money pissed away on consultants for barely-needed roadwork! Accelerate the water main work even more!! - Kevin Coffey
5. By the way, we--residents--pay the state taxes, too. So there is no "free" state money! - Kevin Coffey
6. Consultant-speak for more \$\$\$. Use the data available now to improve the intersections now, maybe with mere (cheap) painting and signage. - Kevin Coffey
7. Also, the earlier plans for the neighborhood (from 2010, I think) were a little more expansive with general beautification of the neighborhood. Is that still a possibility/will it be part of this project? - Mujde Yuksel
8. This project has been discussed and explored since 2007. What is different this time with regards to the project taking shape and construction starting? - Mathew McLean

## **PROJECT FUNDING & STATUS - RESPONSES**

The project construction would be funded as part of MassDOT's Transportation Improvement Program which utilizes federal and state funds. The design fees are being paid for with funds from the Columbia Gas mitigation. As mentioned during the public meeting, the Town is currently budgeting/performing as much water main replacement as is feasible on an annual basis.

# **CANTERBURY STREET INTERSECTION - QUESTIONS**

- 1. Traffic entering 133 from Canterbury is sometimes at risk because the view east is partially obstructed by the landscaping of the house on the corner. Can something be done to improve visibility there? - Rich Nill**
- 2. Please be aware that there is a chronic problem in the wintertime with ice buildup on the roadway at the end of Canterbury where it enters 133. Some issue with road drainage there. Just when you are trying to stop, your vehicle slides into the intersection - Rich Nill**
- 3. What would help sight lines at Canterbury? - Carolyn Dann**

**CANTERBURY  
STREET  
INTERSECTION -  
RESPONSE**

**Thank you for pointing out these concerns; we will review in more detail. The sight lines can be improved by trimming back the vegetation.**

## **INFRASTRUCTURE - QUESTIONS**

- 1. there's a significant drainage issue in the westbound lane between #95 and #97; the storm drain backs up across the road whenever there is heavy rain - Sarah Gaden**

**INFRASTRUCTURE  
- RESPONSE**

**Thank you for sharing this information.  
We will review the existing conditions  
and drainage system in this area.**

# **COMMERCIAL VEHICLE RESTRICTIONS - QUESTIONS**

- 1. The only commercial businesses are at the ENDS of the corridor! Let the commercial vehicles use I-93 for the businesses near there and use I-495 for the businesses there!  
- Kevin Coffey**
- 2. Lowell St. should be an Andover resident access/egress route, not a general thoroughfare! - Kevin Coffey**
- 3. What about a curfew for commercial traffic? - Peter Andrews**



## **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Question: Given the timeline, will the road be equipped in any special way to handle autonomous vehicles? - Michael Coyne**

**Response: The project does not currently include specific provisions for autonomous vehicles. New traffic signal equipment will meet MassDOT standards and must be approved MassDOT products.**

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Question: Why are not ALL participants questions made public and seen by all? - Kevin Coffey**

**Response: Comments are kept private during the meeting to avoid potentially inappropriate/offensive postings. Following the meeting, all comments are posted on the project webpage.**

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Question: "Supportive" oof exactly the same things? Or, did people have different notions of what might make sense? - Kevin Coffey**

**Response: The survey question reads, "What is your overall level of support for the project."**

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Question: In some areas, bike lanes have been designed with a green marked area at intersections in front of the stop line for cars so that cars would always see the bikes, rather than bikes being at risk of accidents with right-turning cars. Is that being considered here? - Carolyn Dann**

**Response: Green bike markings will be considered at the intersections.**

**Additional methods for safely conveying bicyclists through the intersection will be evaluated and included in the preliminary design plans if feasible.**