

## VIII. TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION

### BACKGROUND

As of 2006, the private vehicle still dominates as the main mode of transportation and mobility in Lancaster. Many factors contribute to this – land use patterns that separate homes from shopping and school areas, regional growth and transportation patterns that make it possible for people to live far from their places of employment and few feasible alternatives to driving alone, such as public transportation, van pools, organized ride-sharing, walking, or biking. At the same time, there is a growing awareness in Lancaster of the importance and preference of walking and using bikes to driving cars, and also the need to increase these alternatives for young people who cannot yet drive to get to where they want to go. During the 2005-2006 master planning process, there were clear calls from citizen working groups to increase the options throughout town for people who wanted to see more alternatives for walking and biking.

The following Table illustrates the average amounts of travel time Lancaster drivers going to work took to get there, comparing the latest data for 2000 with that for 1990. Average commuting time increased by almost a third in that decade, and the share of workers driving themselves to work increased. The increase in driving a car alone and decreases in carpooling and use of other means of transport are reflective of trends occurring throughout the country.

#### LANCASTER RESIDENTS WORK TRIP MODES

Commuting Mode	1990	2000	% change
Drove car alone	75.2%	79.1%	5.2%
Car pool	10.7%	7.1%	-33.6%
Public transport	0.0%	0.3%	n/a
Walked	12.6%	7.3%	0.8%
Worked at home		5.4%	
Other	1.4%	0.8%	-42.9%
Mean min. to work	20.3	26.2	29.1%
Workers counted	3,255	3,087	-5.2%

Source: US Census 1990 & 2000.

### Traffic

By all accounts, traffic in and through Lancaster has increased steadily and substantially through the last few decades. The Montachusett Regional Planning Commission (MRPC) has been monitoring traffic at many locations throughout its region over the past two decades, including several locations in Lancaster. Here are some results:

#### TRAFFIC CHANGES IN LANCASTER

Street Name	Location	Period	Av annual change
<b>Local street traffic change</b>			
Lunenburg Rd	S. of Rte 2 (Exit 35)	1988-2005	3.9%
Lunenburg Rd	N of Main St (Rte 117)	1983-2003	3.8%
Lunenburg Rd	N. of Fort Pond Rd	1999-2005	3.7%
Lunenburg Rd	S. of Old Union Turnpike	1995-2005	3.2%
North Main St	E. of Interstate 190	1998-2004	3.0%
Seven Bridge	E. of Main St (Rte 70)	1983-2003	3.0%
Main Street	E. of Otis St	1980-2000	2.5%
Main Street	S. of Sevenbridge Rd	1983-2003	1.9%
Main Street	W. of Lunenburg Rd	1983-2003	1.9%
Shirley Rd	N. of Main St (Rte 117)	1983-2005	1.6%
Mill Street	W. of High St (Rte 110)	1980-2003	0.5%
Chase Hill Rd.	N. of Clinton Rd (Rt 62)	1984-2005	0.2%
Mill Street	Btwn Main & Sterling Rd	1984-2004	0.1%
Main Street	At Perkins School	1988-2005	-0.5%
High Street	S. of Old Common Rd	1980-2005	-0.6%
<b>Major Highway traffic change</b>			
Route 117		1992-1998	4.9%
I-190	N. of N. Main St	1983-2001	4.8%
Route 2	W. of Lunenburg Rd	1985-1999	2.0%
<b>Trip generators change</b>			
Population	Lancaster	1985-2005	0.3%
Employment	Lancaster	1985-2005	0.3%

Based Upon MRPC traffic counts, Census data, DET data, Herr & James analysis

An annual rate of almost 4 per cent growth per year, as on Lunenburg Road, means that traffic more than doubled in two decades. Other locations show a more moderate increase. Growth in Lancaster is not the major contributor: local population and jobs increased only about 5 per cent from 1985 to 2005.

The following Table shows the type of vehicles passing along Route 117 in Lancaster from surveys conducted by the MRPC in 1992 and 1998:

#### VEHICLE TYPE AND OCCUPANCY

Route 117 in Lancaster

Consideration	1992	1998
<b>Vehicle Types</b>		
Passenger car	95.5%	93.1%
Light truck	1.5%	1.8%
Heavy truck	2.6%	4.4%
Motorcycle	0.4%	0.6%
Bus	0.2%	0.1%
Occupants per vehicle	1.2	1.3
Average daily traffic	11,392	29,500

Source: MRPC 2003 Transportation Plan

Similarly, a heavy truck goods movement survey conducted by MRPC noted a 45 per cent increase in the number of heavy trucks (weighing 10,000 lbs. or more) registered in Lancaster, from 89 in 1990 to 132 in 2001, and observed the following about truck movement through Lancaster<sup>1</sup>:

There is considerable heavy truck use on the residential streets of Sterling, Old Common, and Deershorn Roads. Truck routing improvements may be needed at these locations.

- Heavy trucks are using a bridge deemed in need of repair located on Route 117 near the Bolton Town Line.
- Heavy trucks must detour around the railroad bridge on Main Street near the Clinton Town line.
- The Main Street Bridge (Route 70) and the Bolton Street Bridge have been sites where heavy trucks were involved in vehicular accidents.
- Better designation of preferred truck routes is needed on Carter Street.
- Route 117, east and west, especially near the intersection of Route 117 and 70, has road sections with steep slopes that could use better truck warning signs or escape ramps.
- Extra lanes on Route 117 east and west, especially near the intersection of Route 117/70 are needed to allow slow moving heavy trucks to pull over and let traffic pass.

#### Safety

According to data collected from the Mass. Registry of Motor Vehicles, Lancaster rated 6<sup>th</sup> highest in number of vehicles injuries, accidents, and fatalities out of the 22 MRPC communities during 1993-1995. During that time there were 457 vehicle-related injuries, four fatalities, and 669 accidents.

Quite a few of these accidents have occurred at some of the key intersections described in a section to follow. Additional roads to study for safety concerns are Gross Lane and Old Turnpike Road, which have

involved a number of fatal accidents.

#### Road Classification

Based upon a State classification system, Lancaster's 68 miles of roads comprise 2.0 miles of interstate roads, 15.6 miles of arterial roads, 13.7 miles collector roads, and 36.9 miles local roads, according to the MRPC 2003 Regional Transportation Plan. Repair or reconstruction on 8.9 miles of those roads is eligible for federal funds.

The road design standards which must be followed to make use of federal or state funds dramatically changed in January 2006 when the Massachusetts Highway Department adopted a *Project Development & Design Guide*, modernizing those rules. They now are far more context-sensitive than in the past, and friendlier to the environment, bicyclists, and pedestrians than in the past. While in the past many rural communities were hesitant to use those funds because of the standards which came with them, they now are far more accommodating to contexts such as Lancaster.

All streets in Lancaster are also classified on the adopted Zoning Map, and setbacks and landscaping rules differ on that basis (Sections 4.21, 13.43 and 13.44). New streets in subdivisions are also classified under subdivision regulations (Section 21 and later), based on different criteria than those of the Zoning or of the State/Federal system. The new *Design Guide*, available for download from the Mass. Highway Department, provides a good resource both for crafting revisions to such local rules and for designing improvements to key intersections in Lancaster, such as those described in the following section.

#### Key Intersections

There are several intersections throughout Lancaster that have been identified as needing study for possible signalization, redesign, and pedestrian adaptation. The Town has compiled a list (see draft Traffic Improvement Plan, Appendix) of several intersections in need of improvement, as well as railroad crossings. The Lancaster E.O. 418 Community Development Plan, the MRPC 2003 Regional Transportation Plan, and the MRPC September 2006 Lancaster Intersection Study also list some, but not all, of these intersections for improvements.

Deleted: ¶



<sup>1</sup> MRPC, 20003 Regional Transportation Plan

1) Route 117(North Main St)/Route I-190 intersection:

Lancaster’s Community Development Plan contains a detailed operational and safety analysis of this intersection of I-190 ramps with North Main Street(Route 117), and recommends that actuated traffic signals be installed by 2010 if potential Lunenburg developments have not occurred that could help cover costs. The MRPC has included this intersection as one of the regional project needs in the 2003 Regional Transportation Plan. Signalization and possible redesign are two alternatives for study.

2) Route 70 (Lunenburg Rd) and Old Union Turnpike.

This intersection, located near entrance/exit ramps to Route 2, also is targeted in the Lancaster Community Development Plan, accompanied by an operation and safety analysis. It is also listed in the future projects summary of the MRPC Regional Transportation Plan. Possible improvements are signalization and redesign.

3) Route 70 (Lunenburg Road) and Fort Pond Road

This is the third of the three intersections targeted in the Community Development Plan (but not in the MRPC Plan or the Town list of targeted intersections). The Plan recommendation is to paint pavement markings on Lunenburg Road on the approaches to Fort Pond Road.

4) Route 70 & Route 117, north and south locations

These two intersections are targeted both by the Town and the MRPC Regional Transportation Plan. They may require signalization, a pedestrian signal cycle, and redesign. The south location may require grade changes on the east side to increase visibility. This area was identified as needing redesign and realignment in the 1967 “Background Studies for the Lancaster Comprehensive Plan” by Planning Services Group.

The following intersections are additional ones identified by the Town as needing study and improvement:

5) Route 70, Sterling Road, Mill Street

Possible signalization, pedestrian cycle, street narrowing.

6) Route 110, Old Common Road, High Street extension, Center Bridge Road, Bolton Road (Five Corners)

Possible signalizations, pedestrian cycle only, redesign to reduce five-way intersection to four-way, sidewalks, reduce curb cuts. This intersection as well was identified in the background study for the 1967 Master Plan for redesign and realignment.

7) Route 110 (High Street extension) and Mill Street.

Possible signalization, safety study, curbs, sidewalk, traffic calming approaches.

8) a) Deershorn Rd & South Meadow Rd  
b) Deershorn Road & Ice House Road  
c) Deershorn Rd, Chace Hill Rd, & Sterling St (Rte 62)  
d) Ice House Rd & Sterling St (Route 62)

These four intersections within close proximity to each other as well as involving the Ice House Rd/rail crossing need to be studied as a group for possible redesign, road closings, and/or signalization.

Other sites to study for possible signalization include sites on Route 70 at the following locations:

- Police and fire stations
- Ambulance building
- Perkins School entrance
- Post Office
- South fire station

Signalization at these locations should also be studied as a group, since signalization at five locations within a relatively short distance could create significant traffic congestion.

*Railroad crossings*

Lancaster presently has 12 at-grade rail crossings where roads cross actively-used railroad tracks. Eleven (11) of these are public crossings; one is with a private road.

MRPC, in its 2003 Regional Transportation Plan, has identified the following rail crossings that are in need of safety improvements. The first three of these are included with cost estimates in the Plan's summary of recommended regional projects:

a) Route 62 (Sterling Road) crossing: an accident occurred here in 1993. The rail tracks cross the intersection at an angle, creating potential for driver confusion. MRPC recommends installation of reflectorized gates. This crossing is included in the Town's list of priority crossings.

b) Seven Bridge Road (Route 117): two accidents occurred in here 1996 and 1997. Despite flashing lights and bell, drivers failed to see or hear the train. Traffic volumes are high on this road. MRPC recommends installation of reflectorized gates here as well.

c & d) Mill Street and Center Bridge Road: these crossings should be considered as well for reflectorized crossings. These are both among the Town's first priorities for gate installations.

Elsewhere in the Plan, MRPC recommends attention to these additional Lancaster rail crossings:

e) Rte 62/South Meadow Rd and Route 117: MRPC recommends installation of gates and a warning system at the railroad crossing here as well. This crossing is among the Town's top four priority crossings to address.

f) Kilbourn Street crossing: this crossing is marked only by a stop sign on one side of tracks. MRPC recommends a standard 'crossing' sign be placed on each approach to the crossing.

For locations of these intersections and railroad crossings, see the Transportation Map at the end of this chapter.

### *Bridges*

MRPC's 2003 Regional Transportation Plan identifies 12 bridges in Lancaster – four of which are identified as functionally obsolete (but not structurally deficient)<sup>2</sup>:

<sup>2</sup> According to the Mass. Highway Department, 'structurally deficient' means a bridge that is considered unsafe. 'Functionally obsolete' refers to bridges that may not have a safety issue per se, but

Lunenburg Rd/Route 2  
Shirley Rd/Route 2  
Jackson Rd/Route 2  
I-190 over Wekepeke Brook

The Regional Transportation Plan also identifies a bridge on Route 117 and another on Bolton Road as being functionally obsolete.<sup>3</sup>

### *Other Transportation Modes*

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

The MBTA commuter rail runs from Leominster along the northernmost Lancaster border with Lunenburg and Shirley. The nearest commuter rail stops to Lancaster are in north Leominster (Nashua Street), and in Shirley (Shirley Center, Front Street). At peak hours these trains run every 25-55 minutes and off-peak every 1-2 hours. The Montachusett Regional Transit Authority (MART) and the MBTA are currently reviewing plans for a regional parking facility and rail station at Devens in Ayer/Shirley. Possible cost estimates for this station range from \$4.1-8.6 million in the 2003 Regional Transportation Plan.

The Worcester B&M Rail route passes through Lancaster as well as Clinton, Harvard, Ayer, and Sterling within the MRPC region, but does not stop in Lancaster.

During the citizen master planning workshops, a recommendation emerged to pursue locating a new commuter rail station in Lancaster. Because of the existing stations in North Leominster, Shirley, and a possible new station at Devens, it may be many years before MART and MBTA consider locating an additional station in this vicinity. Nevertheless, this can remain as a long-term objective in Lancaster's planning goals.

The Montachusett Regional Transit Authority (MART) offers commuter rail buses in Fitchburg,

---

rather may not comply with federal regulations in some other aspect, such as slope, sight distance, or width relative to that of the road.

<sup>3</sup> Bridge numbers : Route 117 bridge #LO2002; Bolton Road bridge #LO2025 (MHD and EOTC, as indicated in MRPC 2003 Regional Transportation Plan.

Leominster, and Gardner, but not Lancaster. MART offers rides for disabled persons and Dial-a-Mart rides to human service agencies for certain sections of Lancaster, but not for the entire town.

#### AIR TRAVEL

There are four municipal airports that serve Lancaster and the region – Fitchburg Municipal Airport (460 flights per day), Gardner Airport in Templeton, Shirley Airport in Shirley, Sterling Airport in Sterling. The largest of these, Fitchburg Airport, offers facilities for personal and corporate flights, air taxi services, scenic rides, and two aircraft maintenance companies. The Fitchburg Airport is located one mile from the North Leominster commuter rail stop.

#### BICYCLE PATHS AND TRAILS

There is already an existing network of trails in Lancaster, as illustrated on the Transportation Map and also on the Open Space & Recreation Map in the Open Space, Recreation, & Natural Resources Chapter of this Master Plan.

Upgrading existing trails and creating trails that connect existing open space and conservation lands in Lancaster was a priority that emerged from the 2005-2006 master planning process.

The MRPC 2003 Regional Transportation Plan includes the proposed Nashua River Bikeway as part of the Nashua River Greenway System. As described in the Open Space, Natural Resources, & Recreation Chapter of this Master Plan, the idea for the Nashua River Greenway system evolved out of Lancaster's 1967 Master Plan and has been endorsed and promoted by the Nashua River Watershed Association and the MRPC. The entire proposed Nashua River Bikeway would be 14 miles long and would connect the urban areas of Fitchburg, Leominster and Clinton. Its section in Lancaster would serve primarily recreational purposes. As a unique regional bikeway, this bikeway is eligible for 100 per cent state funding. MRPC will pursue the project in conjunction with NRWA, Fitchburg, Leominster, Lancaster, and Clinton.

#### *Land Use & Transportation*

Most of the transportation improvements discussed in this Chapter are *mitigating* measures – that is, measures designed to lessen the impact of traffic as it

increases. To be sure, these are important approaches to reduce the hazards created by traffic and to increase the safety of travelers throughout the community. What is also important, however, is to examine and start to address the conditions that generate traffic in the first place. These conditions almost always involve the way land is used for development, not only in the community-at-hand, but in the larger region. As both residential and business development spreads out from urban areas, supported by highway systems, people are able to live farther from the places they work, but forced to commute by private vehicles, especially when there is no easy or quick mode of public transportation. In Lancaster, much of the increasing traffic in the last two decades is residents and out-of-towners commuting from their homes to work, passing through Lancaster to access Routes 2 and I-190.

The substantial increases in freeway and major arterial traffic measured within Lancaster shown on the Table on p. VIII-1 substantiate this observation – increasing traffic is a regional phenomenon. To address a major cause of increasing traffic within its boundaries, Lancaster will need to join with its neighboring communities in a regional effort to slow down, and hopefully, eventually to reduce traffic volumes throughout the region. Such an effort will need to address issues of curbing sprawl through 'smart growth' land use and transportation strategies, involving changing land use patterns to make it more possible for people to live and shop near their workplaces and vice versa.

While this may seem like a monumental task, working through a regional planning commission such as MRPC makes an initiative such as this possible and feasible. Lancaster can also start to reshape its own land use regulations in the directions outlined in the Land Use Chapter of this Plan. That will also eventually bring about a reduction in traffic as people become more able to reach destinations with shorter and fewer vehicle trips.

#### *Fiscal and Institutional Context*

Lancaster appropriates about \$500,000 per year for Public Works services, most but not all of which goes for road maintenance and improvements. With 68 miles of roads that leaves little for funding improvements other than localized problem-solving. Under Chapter 90 the State allocates funds from Highway Bond revenues for local street work and related efforts under a formula which in recent years

has provided less than \$200,000 per year in Lancaster for reimbursing eligible expenditures. The “wish list” of needed improvements is far larger than such funding can cover.

Additionally, non-formula state and federal assistance to localities for streets and related transportation and related enhancements efforts is made annually through a process of allocation from the State to its Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), which for Lancaster is the Montachusett MPO. The MPOs in turn respond to municipal proposals for funding, placing them into an annually updated five-year plan, and then into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the region.

In recent years the Montachusett MPO TIP serving 22 municipalities has scheduled about \$25 million annually for highway-related projects and \$30 million for MART, or about ten times as much per community as Lancaster appropriates for similar purposes. Even so, those funds fall far short of filling all regional needs, so the process for gaining funding is a highly competitive one, but one worth competing in, because that process is the basic source of most aid over and above the routine Chapter 90 distributions.

Some federal and state transportation funding comes via alternative routes. Transportation-related enhancements for historic preservation, open space protection, or similar efforts is supported through funds earmarked just for such enhancements of the transportation experience, so don't have to compete with funding for bridges or transit. The areas at the Ponakin and Atherton bridges would be candidates. Finally, the General Court often earmarks funds for specific local projects, in effect short-circuiting the TIP process. It is a court of last resort for projects which for whatever reason appear unlikely to be funded through the usual channels within a reasonable period of time.

It has become routine that municipalities support the early design costs of projects proposed to be funded through the TIP. At the state level that is seen as a means of stretching scarce state dollars while also ensuring that there is a demonstration of strong local support for any proposed project.

Frustrations with the pace of that procedure have led many communities to in recent years reverse the tradition of localities providing infrastructure to

attract business. Increasingly, municipalities are getting businesses to participate in the costs of transportation improvements which relate to their development, thereby more rapidly gaining needed infrastructure. There are many variations on the approach, including use of gifts, fees, and earmarking of tax revenues from benefiting development through the state's TIF and DIFF statutory provisions.

That context creates incentives for municipalities to plan a rich array of potential projects well ahead, and to also carefully assign priorities among them. It also creates incentives for municipalities to guide their development in ways which will reduce to the extent to which they impose unmitigated impacts on the transportation system.

## GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Citizens at both the May and November, 2005 master planning workshops identified goals, objectives, and actions to improve the Town's transportation and circulation. Based on that and on later studies these goals have emerged:

- Improved traffic control and flow throughout Lancaster, including better traffic enforcement and controls at key intersections.
- Enhanced mobility for those not able to drive or who choose not to use automobiles, including:
  - Lancaster being more bicycle-friendly, creating paths that connect destinations and designating bike lanes on major roadways.
  - Lancaster being more pedestrian-friendly, for example, installing sidewalks at key areas.
  - Other mobility support being provided, such as ride-sharing and public transportation.
- Land use and development being well-shaped for compatibility with transportation objectives, and transportation shaped to improve, not disrupt, neighborhoods.

## IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS

The following actions are identified to implement the above goals:

## TRAFFIC MITIGATION

- Improve both vehicular and pedestrian safety throughout the Town through traffic enforcement, education, exhortation, and improved signage, in particular focusing on the main roads including Route 70, Lunenburg Road, Sterling Road and Main Street. Consider hiring another part or full-time traffic officer with costs to be recovered from citation revenue.
- Conduct traffic and redesign studies for key intersections listed in this Plan Chapter to reduce traffic accidents, and to enable safe pedestrian crossings and emergency vehicle access. Local participation in preliminary engineering costs is commonly critical to success in applying for state highway funds to defray detailed engineering and construction costs.
- Press for installation of railroad crossing gates and signals at identified locations in this Plan Chapter. If neither the railroads nor the State will take action, then seek funding through grants from the State's Highway Funds.
- Explore the possible establishment of truck routes to direct truck traffic along specific corridors. Particular attention for truck rerouting should be given to Sterling, Old Common, and Deershorn Roads, as recommended in the MRPC Regional Transportation Plan. Review potential proposals with the Mass. Highway Department
- Explore possible new road alignments to potentially reduce traffic congestion and neighborhood disturbance issues. Seek Mass. Highway Department input on any potential proposals which emerge.

## ROAD STANDARDS

- Develop and adopt context-sensitive road standards for new subdivision roads to provide for road design appropriate to the differing characters of the Town areas (Town Center, Community, Enterprise, and Countryside, as described in the Land Use Chapter).
- Reconsider and potentially revise the existing classification of roads under zoning in light of the new MA classification and the potential use

of such classifications as one basis for setting intensity of use standards in the Zoning Bylaw.

## BIKE-FRIENDLY ACTIONS

- Work with the MRPC, Fitchburg, Leominster, and Clinton to implement the long-proposed Nashua River Bikeway, seeking state and federal funding to accomplish this.
- Prepare a bicycle plan compliant with the new MA Highway *Design Guide* to assist in gaining funding support and to facilitate integration of street and bicycle planning.
- Develop paths and trails to connect the various conservation lands in Lancaster for both bicycle and pedestrian use. Amend Subdivision Regulations to require developer participation when land being subdivided contains a portion of such routes. In addition, seek both private donations and volunteer time to accomplish this.
- Designate bike lanes on major roads where feasible, such as along Routes 70, 117, 110 and 62. Include bike lane painting and signing as part of the street striping program that could be paid for through highway funds and grants.
- Pursue obtaining access to old Shirley Road through military conservation land (the future Oxbow area) for creation of a bike path connecting through Jackson Road and Devens.

## PEDESTRIAN-FRIENDLY IMPROVEMENTS

- Conduct traffic and redesign studies for key intersections listed in this Plan Chapter to reduce traffic accidents, and to enable safe pedestrian crossings. Apply for state highway funds to defray costs.
- Provide sidewalks along major roads, in particular Routes 117, 62, and 110, in conjunction with any proposed street reconstruction or where new development occurs on adjacent land.
- Install benches along these sidewalks to create resting areas for pedestrians.
- Restore and enhance the Ponakin and Atherton bridge areas to create pedestrian and bicycle

opportunities. Possible improvements include creating picnic and fishing areas and bicycle parking. Seek funding through the federally funded Transportation Enhancements program, administered by the MA Highway Department.

- Through a resolution or other action, seek Town Meeting endorsement of a policy that roadway modifications should never, on balance, degrade either bicyclist or pedestrian accommodations. Wherever possible, they should improve accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians by fully as much as they improve auto accommodations.

#### LAND USE

- Implement the regulatory implementing actions of the Land Use Chapter of this Plan as a means of reducing in-town traffic over the long term.
- Revise land use regulations to include trip generation as a criterion for permit approval, using appropriate trip generation standards to ensure that the traffic generated by new development will be consistent with the Plan-intended capacity of the roads being impacted, with those planned capacities in turn being tuned for appropriateness in the different Policy Areas in Lancaster.
- Adopt zoning and subdivision regulation amendments ensuring that new developments over a threshold size make provisions for or contributions towards pedestrian and bicycle accommodation, including as appropriate either sidewalks or off-road trails, bicycle racks, and easy pedestrian access into business complexes.
- Amend zoning's parking controls to better ensure well-designed access between streets and large parking areas.
- Work with neighboring communities and the Montachusett Regional Planning Commission to find solutions to trip reduction, more compact, mixed-use land development patterns, and expanded public transportation throughout the region.

For example, in 2000 more than half of the jobs in Lancaster were held by residents of just Lancaster, Leominster, and Clinton, while more

than a third of all Lancaster resident workers had jobs in those same three communities. Is there a possible regional initiative to take advantage of that pattern to support alternatives to drive-alone?

#### OTHER

- Develop and establish a sponsorship program for parks and intersections ("Adopt-a-street") in Lancaster. Sponsors would provide some minimal landscaping maintenance and improvements such as plantings. Install signage at the locations to identify and acknowledge these sponsors.
- Explore establishment of a program for over time laying out and proposing for acceptance by town meeting those private roads which have been improved to meet standards to be established for such streets. Following acceptance, those streets would then be maintained by the Town and traffic enforcement by the Town would be enabled.

#### APPENDIX

Herr & James Associates, "Lancaster's Preparedness for Guiding Growth: A Diagnostic". November 9, 2005.

"Traffic, Transportation, & Mobility Topic Group Report", November, 2005

Bruce Hamblin, "Draft Traffic Improvement Plan, Lancaster Community Development & Planning Department," undated.

#### OTHER REFERENCED MATERIAL

Montachusett Regional Planning Commission, *Regional Transportation Plan 2003*.

Montachusett Regional Planning Commission, *Traffic Study of Selected Intersections for the Town of Lancaster*, September, 2006.

Montachusett Regional Planning Commission, *Lancaster Community Development Plan (E.O. 418)*, June, 2004.

Massachusetts Highway Department, *Project Design*

& *Development Guide*, January, 2006.  
[www.mhd.state.ma.us/](http://www.mhd.state.ma.us/)

Planning Services Group, "Background Studies for  
the [Lancaster] Comprehensive Plan," 1967.

January 26, 2007 PLAN TRANSPORT ELEMENT.DOC

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

