Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Project Kick-Off Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, January 25, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:00 AM
LOCATION: Mayflower Room, Plymouth Town Hall
ATTENDEES: (see attached sign-in sheet)

Meeting Summary

Frank Gay, GATRA, opened the meeting and attendees introduced themselves.

Mr. Gay explained that the project is being led by GATRA in cooperation with the Town of Plymouth and the Plymouth Growth and Development Corporation. The cost of the contract is funded by:

- Federal Transit Agency (FTA) funding provided to GATRA - 80%
- Town of Plymouth – 10%
- Plymouth Growth and Development Corporation – 10%

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, explained that the consultant team will work with the Study Steering Committee to identify key milestones for the project and solicit feedback throughout the anticipated 12-month long project. Communication will flow through GATRA. The consultant team includes:

- McMahon Associates as the prime consultant and transportation planning and engineering functions
- DHK Architects for conceptual design
- Simon Engineering for parking garage expertise
- GLC Development Resources for public/private partnerships and real estate development
- Nitch Engineering for land surveying
- CDW Consultants for environmental work
Discussion by the group included the following:

- **2007 Plymouth Public Space Action Plan** was to identify downtown locations with development potential. An outcome of the project was a brief review of potential consolidated parking facilities in downtown in order to free up existing surface lots that could be used for better purposes.

- The 2007 Study identified five potential sites for parking. Two other locations that have been considered are (1) Former Courthouse area; and (2) Radisson lot in the northeast area of downtown.

- It was noted that the change in elevation from the waterfront to the Court Street/Main Street area, combined with artesian conditions of the aquifer and tides, could make construction challenging, depending upon which sites show promise.

- Borings may have been completed for the Main/Market Street public parking area, and the nearby bridge (Whitman/Howard).

- Bill Shaw of Associated Engineering of Plymouth may be a good point of contact for locating data and resources that may be available to establish existing conditions in the downtown.

- Potential components of a multimodal center were discussed (Attachment C). This project will be unique to the needs of Plymouth. It will be important through this process to clearly define the purpose and need for the project.

- There was some discussion of the type and scale of multimodal facilities in other communities. The Newburyport facility was intentionally designed as a large, centralized facility. While Holyoke is a smaller facility designed to serve local transit connections, and is housed in a historic building.

- Concern was expressed by some to maintain the scale and character of the downtown area.

- Discussion also included whether the Plymouth multimodal center accommodate intercity travel provided by Plymouth and Brockton and charter services, or just local GATRA service and paratransit.

- Parking needs vary by season and with special events. Centralized parking in downtown, or remote parking near Route 3 with feeder service to downtown, must consider circulation within the downtown itself.
• The potential for a jitney service in downtown has been discussed. A prior “on demand” type of trolley service was tried and discontinued due to lack of use.

• Circulation in downtown needs to serve both the residents of Plymouth (trips related to daily business of town) and visitors who typically stay for 4 hours (day trips) or overnight (tours).

• Some feel more resident parking is needed. Park Plymouth has a parking permit program whereby approximately 1100 of the 1400 total permits are Plymouth resident permits. The resident permits are not currently restricted to specific lots but are restricted with respect to on-street parking.

• Plymouth lodging currently experiences approximately 61.5% occupancy. This exceeds the rates of competing communities in the region, but falls short of the 90% occupancy goal. Plymouth is a logical place to visit from Boston, but limited transportation options make marketing difficult.

• Many visitors focus on the attractions in the Water Street area and never make it to the downtown core of Court/Main Street, and are unaware of other local attractions. The steepness of the hill acts as a deterrent for visitors to walk between the two areas.

• Plymouth and Brockton is unlikely to have intercity buses travel through downtown.

It was agreed that the Study Steering Committee meetings will be held monthly on the last Tuesday of the month at 10AM in the Mayflower Room of Town Hall. The next meeting is February 22.
Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, February 22, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:00 AM
LOCATION: Mayflower Room, Plymouth Town Hall

ATTENDEES:
Leighton Price, PGDC
Paul Cripps, PCDC/DP
Mark Stankiewicz, Town Manager
Chris Anzuoni, P&B
Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse
Bob Wollner, PRA
Michael Hanlon, Fin Com
John Burke, PGDC
Joanne LaFerrara, GATRA
David Farmer, McMahon
Christi Apicella, McMahon

Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting. The summary of the 1/25/11 meeting was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and hard copies were made available. There were no modifications to the summary proposed by those in attendance.

Mr. Farmer and Christi Apicella, McMahon Associates, reviewed data and information gathering tasks that have been completed to date:
- Parking data
- Available traffic counts
- Existing plans and reports such as the 2003 Downtown Waterfront Area Parking Analysis; 2006 Master Plan; and 2007 Plymouth Public Space Action Plan
- Transit services and connections
- Meeting and consultation with Plymouth & Brockton bus service; Bill Shaw, Associated Engineering; Charter Bus companies

The group discussed the history of the Middle Street parking area:
- A proposal in the 1970’s to expand off-street parking apparently would have required removal of a historic house, realignment of Middle Street, and other property impacts
that resulted in the proposed parking expansion to be scaled back to what primarily exists today.

- Residents and businesses have changed hands since the initial proposal in the 1970’s, so conditions may have changed regarding potential support or opposition to additional off-street parking on Middle Street.
- Site assessments for potential development should include a review of possible archaeological impacts.

The group discussed the history of the Market/School Street parking area:

- In recent memory, there have been two separate proposals for parking decks or structures at this location:
  - David Crowly, local architect, developed one set of plans on behalf of adjacent property owners. The Board of Selectmen did not approve the proposal.
  - A private developer proposed parking, but allocation of spaces between private development and public use could not be agreed upon and the proposal did not advance. Dennis Hanks, Chamber of Commerce, may have details.
- John Burke has renderings of both proposals, and will provide McMahon with copies.
- There was some discussion of adding parking meters on Court Street associated with the previous Market/School Street garage proposals. The change in on-street parking regulations was controversial.
- This location has the following advantages:
  - Proximity to Brewster Gardens and the south end of downtown
  - Access to/from Route 3 via Summer Street.
  - An easy walk to the waterfront area, due to less severe slopes than other downtown locations
- Due to proximity to Town Brooke, there may be underground springs that limit construction options.

The group also discussed the importance of having a coordinated on-street and off-street parking program as part of the multimodal transit center and/or parking garage. Park Plymouth is currently pursuing a number of parking management programs and strategies as a result of the 2003 Downtown Waterfront Area Parking Analysis. The McMahon team will develop a pro forma for the multimodal center.

Plymouth & Brockton has stated that they plan to continue to provide intercity services in the Route 3 corridor, but do not plan to use the downtown multimodal center.

- This may require that the multimodal transit center and a potential parking garage or deck proceed separately, since a significant amount of commuter parking is not likely to be needed at the center.
• Federal Transit Administration (FTA) could potentially fund a multimodal center, but it generally will not provide funding for parking that is not closely associated with a transit use.

There are two general needs for transit in Plymouth:
• Intercity access
• Downtown services
For special events, there is a need for both at the same time.

Special events in downtown Plymouth include 4th of July fireworks, parades, and the annual Thanksgiving Celebration. All three have large parking demands for the specific events and many use remote parking locations. These events may be good case studies for analyzing options for remote parking. Old Colony Planning Council (OCPC) will be evaluating transportation issues associated with special events, and could address some of the Plymouth “pinch points” between Route 3 and the downtown.

There was some discussion regarding the latest technology for parking management, enforcement, and user interfaces. Conversations included the following:
• Applicability of technology such as “Next Bus” used for transit.
• Use of electronic payment capabilities (i.e., cell phones) that could become more widely applied for a user interface to search for available parking spaces in real time.
• Park Plymouth is moving toward new technology for parking management and enforcement in downtown Plymouth.
• Federal funding sources may view technology and programs that enhance “livability” of a community favorably.

The group discussed some of the economic development potential of Cordage Park and Village Landing that could potentially serve as transportation nodes.
• The former railroad right of way connects the two areas and could provide an opportunity to link the downtown with the Plymouth Commuter Rail Station. A bicycle path currently runs between the two locations.
• McMahon Associates will check with the MBTA Real Estate Department regarding potential ownership and agreements of the MBTA-owned ROW in the vicinity of the Radisson Hotel.
• The McMahon Team will schedule meetings with committee members as needed to review plans for these areas.

Monthly meetings will continue to be held at 10:00 a.m. the last Tuesday of the month. The next meeting will be held Tuesday, March 29. McMahon Associates will provide a project schedule with specific milestones.
Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, February 22, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:00 AM
LOCATION: Mayflower Room, Plymouth Town Hall

Agenda

1. Introductions and January 25, 2011 kickoff meeting summary (5 minutes)

2. Information gathering to date (20 minutes)
   a. Parking data
   b. Available traffic counts
   c. Plans and reports
   d. Transit service and connections
   e. Miscellaneous updates

3. Project Goals – group discussion (10 minutes)

4. Evaluation Criteria – initial discussion (15 minutes)

5. Public Communications (2 minutes)

6. Wrap up (5 minutes)
   a. Meeting Tuesday, March 29 at 10:00 AM
Timeline of Prior Parking Studies

1953: Parking Regulations Adopted
1958: Downtown Parking Needs Study (200 spaces)
1961: Comp. Plan Update
1966: Comp. Plan Update
1979: Waterfront Urban Design Plan (450 spaces)

1971: Downtown Parking Needs Study
1970’s to 1988:
- Middle Street parking expanded to 87
- 4 Studies: Memorial Hall (2), Middle Street, Market

1989: “Plymouth Compact of 1949”
2007: Plymouth Public Space Action Plan (5 sites)
2004: Strategic Action Plan (garage suggested)
2006: Master Plan 2004-2024
2003: “Downtown Waterfront Area Parking Analysis” (618 spaces)
1999: Plymouth Waterfront Area Master Plan"
Goals (from RFP)

- Establish an intermodal facility in the downtown area.
  ✓ Transportation center to seamlessly coordinate and integrate various modes of transportation and services at a central location.
  ✓ Accommodate increased tourism in a sustainable and comprehensive strategy.
  ✓ Facility would not only serve visitors but residents, employees and local merchants as well.
  ✓ Adequate to serve the existing and future demands for transit service in Plymouth

- Create a stronger link between the train station and its downtown and waterfront.
  ✓ A critical missing link in the transportation system that would allow for a full realization of the mobility benefits derived from the local and regional transit system, is the creation of a downtown multimodal transit/parking facility

- Connections to the rail/bus infrastructure and local transit services to increase visitation into historic Plymouth is a major goal

- Provide centrally located parking with strong transit connections

- Take a comprehensive look at how a future multimodal parking facility would operate as the center of Plymouth's transportation network.

- Redevelop certain existing surface parking lots for a higher and better use, by consolidating parking in a structure

From other plans:

- Provide a parking/intermodal center that is consistent with the historic character of downtown

- Incorporate “liner” buildings to shield open air garages from important public views

- Relocate a portion of existing harbor-side on-grade parking into the town fabric as close to Main and Court Streets as possible.
GATRA/Plymouth Intermodal Transit Center
Site Selection Criteria for Discussion – Feb 22, 2011

TRANSIT NEEDS
• Ability to accommodate transportation program
  ✓ Number of GATRA buses & paratransit
  ✓ Downtown shuttles/trolleys
  ✓ Other transit providers?
  ✓ Sheltered passenger waiting area
  ✓ Ticketing
  ✓ Pick-up/drop-off area/Taxis
  ✓ Pedestrian access
  ✓ Number of parking spaces
• Transit Operations
  ✓ Transit operating efficiency
  ✓ Ability to encourage new riders
  ✓ Ability to serve needs of existing customers
  ✓ Flexibility to accommodate future transit needs
  ✓ Traffic impacts

PARKING NEEDS
• Required parking capacity
  ✓ Support transit
  ✓ Downtown employees
  ✓ Downtown visitors – daily business
  ✓ Downtown visitors – tourism/day trips
  ✓ Special Events
• Traffic impacts

ACCESSIBILITY
• Proximate to waterfront and Court/Main Street
• Links to key destinations in downtown area
• Quality of pedestrian environment
  ✓ Avoid steep grades
  ✓ Safe, visible, connections
  ✓ Convenient connections
  ✓ Streetscape design
• MA Access and ADA standards compliance

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
• Compatibility with surrounding historic district, sites and structures
• Compatibility with surrounding land uses
• Minimal impact on harbor
• Ease of environmental permitting
• Minimal site remediation required

DEVELOPMENT ISSUES
• Ownership and ease of acquisition
• Ability to accommodate secondary uses
• Opportunity for public-private partnership (PPP)
• Compatibility with downtown plans
• Constructability
• Pro-Forma performance
• Potential funding sources

SITE CONFIGURATION
• Size and configuration
• Pedestrian access
• Flexibility for massing of the structure
Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, March 29, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:00 AM
LOCATION: Harbor Room, Plymouth Town Hall

ATTENDEES:

Leighton Price, PGDC
Donna Fernandez, PGDC
Patrick O’Brien, Town of Plymouth
Alan Zanotti, PGDC
Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse
Bob Wollner, PRA

Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting. The summary of the 2/22/11 meeting was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and hard copies were made available. It was noted that David Crowley’s name was spelled incorrectly.

Mr. Farmer reviewed the proposed project timeline (please see attached), which assumes a public meeting in mid- to late May, pending the outcome of this Steering Committee meeting.

Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse Committee, provided an overview of the Courthouse planning efforts:

- CBT Architects signed a contract 3/28/11 to complete a Historic Structures Report. They are presenting their project approach to the Board of Selectmen tonight.
- The study should be complete in the early Fall 2011, and should coordinate well with the Multimodal Transit Center Site Selection Study
- The façade and original building (circa 1857) will remain. The 1914 and 1960 additions, and separate jail building, are likely less feasible for reuse options.

Mr. Farmer reviewed updated Site Selection criteria, which has been refined to include program details such as the number of GATRA bus berths, preliminary parking demand (based on prior studies), and potential joint development options. Please see attached draft criteria. A sample
“footprint” for a 7 berth bus facility and a 160 space level of parking were provided to indicate the scale of the site that will be needed to accommodate the development program. The following points were discussed:

- The proposed 7 bus berths for GATRA accommodate the 4-5 current routes and allow for potential expansion of operations in the future.
- Plymouth & Brockton does not have an interest in using a downtown intermodal facility at this time, but the potential to accommodate larger inter-city carriers in the future should be kept in mind for design options. This type of vehicle may be accommodated on-street.
- If a transit center displaces parking then, at a minimum, that parking should be replaced as part of the project. There may be opportunities to further expand parking capacity as part of a public/private partnership.

Mr. Farmer and Christi Apicella, McMahon Associates, presented a summary of eight potential sites for the multimodal center. The potential sites were identified through the 2007 Plymouth Public Space Action Plan, discussion with the Steering Committee, and a recent site walk. They are presented in the order that they became known to the consultant team, and not in order of preference. A list of pros and cons in terms of a particular site’s ability to accommodate key elements of the program were presented (see attached). This analysis will be used to complete a matrix of site options according to specific criteria.

As a result of the discussion of pros/cons, the group agreed that there could be three categories of potential sites:

- A multimodal center to serve GATRA services and downtown parking needs
- A multimodal center with a transit focus and replacement parking, but no additional parking capacity for the downtown area
- If only replacement parking can be fit at the multimodal center, or if additional parking is needed beyond what can be provided at the multimodal center, secondary sites to provide additional downtown parking.

The consultant team will continue to refine the pros/cons for each site based on the discussion at the meeting, and input from consultant team members such as DHK Architects and Simon Design Engineering. The group agreed that a public meeting end of May/beginning of June is an accurate target date.

Monthly meetings will continue to be held at 10:00 a.m. the last Tuesday of the month. The next meeting will be held Tuesday, April 26 in the Mayflower Room.
## Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

### Study Steering Committee

### March 29, 2011 – Progress Meeting Sign-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leighton Price</td>
<td>PGDC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leightonaprice@yahoo.com">leightonaprice@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>508-224-3441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cripps</td>
<td>PCDC/DP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.cripps@seeplymouth.com">paul.cripps@seeplymouth.com</a></td>
<td>508-747-0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna M. Fernandes</td>
<td>PGDC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donna.fernandes@engelvoelkers.com">donna.fernandes@engelvoelkers.com</a></td>
<td>508-747-7755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Garrett</td>
<td>Plym PB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:accomack1@verizon.net">accomack1@verizon.net</a></td>
<td>508-747-3553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stankiewicz</td>
<td>Town Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mstankiewicz@townhall.plymouth.ma.us">mstankiewicz@townhall.plymouth.ma.us</a></td>
<td>508-747-1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Apicella</td>
<td>McMahon Associates</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine.apicella@mcmtrans.com">christine.apicella@mcmtrans.com</a></td>
<td>508-823-2245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O'Brien</td>
<td>Town of Plymouth</td>
<td>po’<a href="mailto:brien@townhall.plymouth.ma.us">brien@townhall.plymouth.ma.us</a></td>
<td>508-747-1620 x 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burke</td>
<td>PGDC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jburke3142@gmail.com">jburke3142@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>508-641-2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Anzuoni</td>
<td>P&amp;B</td>
<td><a href="mailto:canzuoni@p-b.com">canzuoni@p-b.com</a></td>
<td>508-732-6046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Rosenblum</td>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lrosenblum@urbanimage.com">lrosenblum@urbanimage.com</a></td>
<td>508-224-2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Wollner</td>
<td>PRA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wollner@verizon.net">wollner@verizon.net</a></td>
<td>508-746-4120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hanlon</td>
<td>Fin Com</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hanlonm@wseinc.com">hanlonm@wseinc.com</a></td>
<td>978-764-6807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gay</td>
<td>GATRA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fgay@gatra.org">fgay@gatra.org</a></td>
<td>508-823-8828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Farmer</td>
<td>McMahon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.farmer@mcmtrans.com">david.farmer@mcmtrans.com</a></td>
<td>508-823-2245 x3001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Zaudt</td>
<td>PGDC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.zaudt@poland.com">a.zaudt@poland.com</a></td>
<td>508-320-8544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site Selection Study for a Multimodal Transportation Facility, Plymouth, MA

### Draft Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task I -- Coord, Outreach &amp; Mtgs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task II -- I.D. &amp; Evaluate 6 to 8 Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Review of Past Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Parking and Transit Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Identify 6 to 8 Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Evaluation/Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Select Two Finalist Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task III -- Evaluation of 2 Finalist Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Selected Site Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Prelim. Environmental Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Prefiling MEPA/NEPA coord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Traffic Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Real Estate and Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Impacts and Environ. Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Transit Service Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Refined Demand Estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Concept Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task IV -- Site Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Finalize Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Full land survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Conduct Phase I ESA (CH 21E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Joint MEPA/NEPA Filing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task V -- Draft and Final Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions:
- Outreach and coordination meetings with stakeholders (Task 1) will be ongoing on an as-needed basis
- Study Steering Committee meetings will be held the last Friday of each month, unless a Public Meeting is scheduled
- The detailed evaluation of the 2 sites will occur during the summer months
- Public Meetings are anticipated prior to Memorial Day, after Labor Day, and at the end of the project
- Public Meetings are not scheduled during the summer months due to anticipated low attendance
- The final Public Meeting will be coordinated with any MEPA/NEPA requirements
GATRA/Plymouth Intermodal Transit Center
Site Selection Needs and Criteria – for Discussion March 29, 2011

SPACE PLANNING

TRANSIT NEEDS
• Ability to accommodate transportation program
  ✓ Six (6) GATRA bus berths (4 current + 2 growth)
  ✓ One (1) additional berth (shuttles/trolleys)
  ✓ Passenger waiting/ticketing area (2500 SF*)
  ✓ Pick-up/drop-off/taxi area (curbside)
  ✓ Pedestrian access (via sidewalks)
  ✓ Bicycle facilities (200 SF, outdoors)
  ✓ Staff parking spaces (incorporated into garage)

PARKING NEEDS
• Required parking capacity (400-600 spaces)
  ✓ Downtown employees
  ✓ Downtown visitors – daily business
  ✓ Downtown visitors – tourism/day trips
  ✓ Special Events

OTHER FACILITY PROGRAMMING
• Public-private or public-public partnership (PPP)
  ✓ Possible co-location of PGDC (2500 SF*)
  ✓ Possible co-location of Visitors (2500 SF*)
• Other prospective tenants

FUNCTIONAL & DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

SITE CONFIGURATION & ACCESSIBILITY
• Size and configuration of site
• Proximate to waterfront and Court/Main Street
• Access to key destinations in downtown area
• Quality of pedestrian environment
  ✓ Avoid steep grades
  ✓ Safe, visible, connections
  ✓ Convenient connections
  ✓ Streetscape design
• MA Access and ADA standards compliance
• Transportation Operations
  ✓ Transit operating efficiency
  ✓ Ease of vehicular parking access
  ✓ Ability to encourage new riders
  ✓ Ability to serve needs of existing customers (e.g., co-location of government or social services)
  ✓ Flexibility to accommodate future transit needs
  ✓ Traffic impacts

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
• Compatibility with historic district, sites and structures
• Compatibility with surrounding land uses
• Minimal impact on environment
• Ease of environmental permitting
• Minimal site remediation required

DEVELOPMENT ISSUES
• Ownership and ease of acquisition
• Ability to accommodate secondary uses
• Compatibility with downtown plans
• Pro-Forma performance
• Potential funding sources

(*Assumed total 7500 SF basic needs in building = 50 ft x 150 ft)
(A) 1620 Restaurant/Citizens Bank

PRO
- Supports waterfront uses
- High visibility enhances safety
- Primary parcel is relatively flat (grade separation with Citizens Bank)
- Existing buildings provide some screening for parking
- Privately owned site is currently for sale

CON
- Distance from downtown core
- Parking is generally not the highest and best use for a waterfront parcel
- Cost of property is ~$4 million

(B) Memorial Drive

PRO
- Currently used for public parking (116 spaces)
- Supports waterfront uses
- Proximity to existing visitor center
- Supports Memorial Hall events and north Court Street area
- Ease of access from Route 44
- Gradual grade of site supports development
- Potential to screen parking with liner buildings and existing surrounding uses
- General community support for parking
- Town-owned

CON
- Distance from Main Street
- Memorial Drive is currently one-way, limiting circulation options
### (C) Probate Court

**PRO**
- Currently for sale
- Potential to combine parking area with Coldwell Banker (grade change)
- Serves Main Street/Court Street area

**CON**
- Narrow driveway to parking behind building limits circulation options
- Distance to waterfront
- Retaining walls on north and south property lines make site expansion difficult

![Map of Probate Court](image)

---

### (D) Main/Market Streets

**PRO**
- Parking for Main Street area
- Southern gateway to downtown
- Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grist Mill, Burial Hill
- Development could complete existing streetwall (split issue)
- General community support for parking
- Town-owned, currently used for parking (555 spaces)

**CON**
- Distance to waterfront attractions north of Mayflower Park
- Development could block viewsheds (split issue)
- Proximity to Town Brook may limit footings/foundation

![Map of Main/Market Streets](image)

---

![Narrow Driveway](image)

![Retaining Wall (South)](image)

![Coldwell Banker Parking](image)

---

![Parking for Main Street Area](image)

![Potentially Blocked Viewsheds](image)
### (E) Middle Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Proximate to waterfront attractions such as Mayflower Park</td>
<td>- Narrow bounds of current site (L-shape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proximate to downtown</td>
<td>- Current 1-way street pattern limits circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relatively flat site</td>
<td>- Distance to waterfront restaurant area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Town-owned, currently used for parking (70 spaces)</td>
<td>- Historic house (currently parking wraps around it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (F) Former Courthouse Block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Proximate to Court/Main Street</td>
<td>- From rear of block: distance and steep slope to waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Courthouse owned by Plymouth Redevelopment Authority, seeking development opportunities</td>
<td>- Three residences between Courthouse and former School/DPW property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Town ownership of former school/DPW buildings to the rear of block</td>
<td>- Parking underutilized now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good access to Route 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Existing public parking  
  Russell: 62  
  Old Police: 32 |   |
(G) Radisson Lot

PRO
- Relatively flat property
- Proximate to waterfront restaurants, but does not occupy prime waterfront real estate
- Potential connections to commuter rail via MBTA right-of-way

CON
- Distance from downtown
- Complicated ownership/easements

(H) Brewster Street Lot

PRO
- Central location for both waterfront and downtown access
- Existing Court Street buildings, and natural grade create screening
- Partial public lot (23 spaces) and Sovereign Bank
- Access via Brewster (2-way) and North Streets

CON
- Somewhat distant from waterfront restaurants and Memorial Hall
- Private land may not be available
Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, April 26, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:00 AM
LOCATION: Harbor Room, Plymouth Town Hall
ATTENDEES:

Leighton Price, PGDC
Paul Cripps, PCDC/DP
Patrick O’Brien, Town of Plymouth
Alan Zanotti, PGDC
Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse
Bob Wollner, PRA
Mark Stankiewicz, Town Manager

Michael Hanlon, Fin Com
John Burke, PGDC
Frank Gay, GATRA
David Farmer, McMahon
Christi Apicella, McMahon
Alan Simon, Simon Design Engineering
Charles Tseckares, CBT/Courthouse

Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting. Alan Simon, Simon Design Engineering, was introduced as the parking specialist for the McMahon-led site selection consultant team. Charles Tskeckares, CBT Architects, also joined the group as an observer, in his role as the consultant to the Courthouse Consortium. The summary of the 3/24/11 meeting was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and hard copies were made available. No changes to the summary were noted.

Mr. Farmer reviewed the general project timeline (presented last month) noting that a public meeting is targeted for the end of May/beginning of June. Mr. Farmer suggested holding the public meeting the beginning of June, in order to allow for an additional Steering Committee meeting to be held prior to the public meeting. The group agreed. Patrick O’Brien will provide to McMahon Associates suggested dates and locations for the public meeting to be held during the week of June 6. The next Steering Committee meeting will be at 10:00 am on Tuesday, May 31 (following Memorial Day).

Mr. Farmer noted that the potential sites “pros/cons” analysis has been updated, based on feedback provided by the March Steering Committee meeting, and consultant team members (see attached). He noted that these posters will serve as the basis for the public meeting.
Participants at the public meeting may also be asked to “vote” for their top two favorite sites and provide a brief reason for the basis of their selection.

Mr. Farmer noted that McMahon Associates is updating the 2003 parking supply and demand analysis for the downtown area. John Burke and Paul Cripps may be able to assist with data needed to complete the analysis.

Mr. Farmer provided two versions of the site selection criteria matrix (see attached):

1. **Site Selection Criteria**: A detailed version of how the pro/con analysis fit into the categories for criteria related to space planning and function and development needs for the multimodal center. The group was encouraged to review this matrix on their own and provide comments to the consultant team.

2. **Reduced Matrix**: A simplified version of the above indicating the strength of a site to accommodate transit, parking, and/or other facility programming (public-private partnerships, prospective tenants, etc.).

It was noted that Site C should be referred to as the “Former Registry Building” and Site F is known as the “Courthouse Corridor.”

Mr. Farmer reviewed the Reduced Matrix, utilizing aerial photographs of each site (see attached) to present preliminary circulation patterns for transit and parking to demonstrate how each would function in plan view. It was noted that some sites (such as the former 1620 Restaurant) appear to work well in two-dimensional plan view, but changes in topography and grade separation between multiple sites may further limit layout options.

Alan Simon, Simon Design Engineering, who is a parking garage specialist familiar with parking constraints in downtown Plymouth due to his involvement with prior parking garage proposals in town, then spoke about parking considerations. Mr. Simon noted that smaller sites are typically more difficult to fund due to the higher costs of parking construction concentrated in a smaller area. Ultimately, site selection is heavily influenced by how much of the cost can be subsidized by parking rates. He noted that a parking space generally must net at least $150 per month to cover operating expenses. This is substantially higher than the parking rates in Plymouth today, particularly since some are at no cost and charges for parking vary by season. A system-wide approach to parking fees is needed to make a parking garage feasible.

John Burke, Plymouth Growth and Development Corporation/Park Plymouth, asked Mr. Simon for a broad estimate of the costs of constructing parking at some of the sites. Mr. Simon estimates that the cost per space at site B – Memorial Drive might be on the order of $12,000 per space, whereas a site like D – Main \Market might be closer to $20,000 per space, and Site H – Brewster Street might be on the order of $40,000 per space. Sites such as the former Registry Building are harder to determine since land acquisition costs need to be considered. It was
noted that those figures should be considered reasonable for comparative purposes; better estimates would require closer examination of the requirements for any particular site.

The group discussed the merits of the Courthouse Corridor for both transit and parking uses, and the potential to combine the site with Site C – Former Registry Building. McMahon agreed to contact the landowners who currently hold the Site C parcels to enquire about their current plans for those parcels. Several participants mentioned the potential for the Courthouse Corridor to shape public-private partnerships throughout the downtown, and the Multimodal Transportation Facility may provide an opportunity to for this to happen in the short-term. McMahon Associates will develop sketches for potential circulation options for the Courthouse Corridor, similar to those presented for other sites.

Based on the discussion, the group agreed that the primary focus should be on identifying a site that can accommodate the full development program (including both transit and parking). Therefore, the Reduced Matrix should be modified to reflect the following:

- **Transit:** Site B (Memorial Hall); Site C (Former Registry); and possibly Site F (Courthouse Corridor), depending upon possible layouts. Sites B and F present the advantage of substantial current public ownership.

- **Parking:** All sites currently contain some parking and could potentially accommodate replacement parking for the transit center, with the exception of Site E (Middle Street) and Site H (Brewster Street) where adding an additional level of parking would be difficult and disproportionally expensive due to site constraints.

Site A – Former 1620 Restaurant, was considered too difficult to pursue due to grade change in combination with anticipated difficulties in land acquisition and access, as portions of the restaurant property and the adjacent bank property would need to be assembled to fit the full transit center program on the site.

Site G – Radisson Parking Lot, was judged to be too far from the downtown core for further consideration as a transit center, and it was agreed that its incorporation as a transit center would entail too many other long-term improvements (connection to the bike path, reconstruction of the surrounding street grid), that are beyond the ability of this project to recommend.

Sites D, E, and H all were deemed to be too small to incorporate the transit program associated with the project.

Monthly meetings will continue to be held at 10:00 a.m. the last Tuesday of the month. The next meeting will be held Tuesday, May 31 (following Memorial Day) in the Mayflower Room.
(A) 1620 Restaurant/Citizens Bank

**PRO**
- Supports waterfront uses
- High visibility enhances safety
- Primary parcel is relatively flat (grade separation with Citizens Bank)
- Existing buildings provide some screening for parking
- Privately owned site is currently for sale
- Ease of access via Exit 6
- Strong connection to Rail Trail
- Allows for consolidation of waterfront parking
- Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns

**CON**
- Distance from downtown core
- Parking is generally not the highest and best use for a waterfront parcel
- Cost of privately-owned property acquisition is ~$4 million
- Depth to groundwater may limit construction

**NOTES**
- Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)
- Could be appealing for regional demand (seasonal & marine)
- Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and providing incentives)

(B) Memorial Drive

**PRO**
- Currently used for public parking (116 spaces) and GATRA bus hub
- Proximity to existing visitor center
- Supports Memorial Hall events and north Court Street area
- Could serve as a connector between waterfront and downtown
- Ease of access via Route 44
- Gradual grade of site supports development
- Potential to screen parking with liner buildings and existing surrounding uses
- Multiple access points possible
- Town-owned
- Larger massing of existing buildings is compatible with a parking structure/multimodal center

**CON**
- Distance from Main Street
- Memorial Drive is currently one-way, limiting circulation options

**NOTES**
- Prior parking garage proposal
- Site is relatively large (compared to others), improving opportunity for “liner buildings”
(C) Probate Court

**PRO**
- Currently for sale
- Potential to combine parking area with Coldwell Banker (grade change)
- Serves Main Street/Court Street area
- Opportunities to combine with courthouse development (Site F)
- Screening with existing buildings
- Ease of access for pedestrians/bikes from Main Street
- Prior public use of the site

**NOTES**
- Land assembly extends project timeline
- Coldwell property owners may be open to combined parking
- Parking capacity likely to be filled by redevelopment of building
- Probate Court property asking price $1.7 million
- Distance to waterfront
- Condos proposed in short-term
- Is the building on the Historic Register?
- Slope may increase options for building parking deck
- Reducing on-street parking would improve traffic flow

**CON**
- Narrow driveway to parking behind building limits circulation options
- Retaining walls on north and south property lines make site expansion difficult
- Slope of Russell Street limits options for bus berths

**D) Main/Market Streets**

**PRO**
- Parking for Main Street area
- Southern gateway to downtown
- Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grist Mill, Burial Hill, Brewster Gardens
- Development could complete existing streetwall (split issue)
- General community support for parking
- Town-owned, currently used for parking (55 spaces)
- Good relationship to established traffic patterns

**NOTES**
- Two prior parking structures proposed; well-studied
- Strategic location for community development
- Potential for on-street bus circulation

**CON**
- Distance to waterfront attractions north of Mayflower Park
- Development could block viewsheds from Main St. (northbound) and John Carver Inn (split issue)
- Proximity to Town Brook may limit footings/foundation
- Small parcel size limits layout options and ability to combine transit and parking
- Small parcel size means parking would be relatively expensive and limited impact on overall capacity

**NOTES**
- Narrow driveway
- Coldwell Banker parking
- Retaining wall (south)
### (E) Middle Street

**PRO**
- Proximate to waterfront attractions such as Mayflower Park
- Proximate to downtown
- Relatively flat site
- Town-owned, currently used for parking (70 spaces)

**CON**
- Distance to waterfront restaurant area
- Not a strong transit site
- Convoluted geometry
- Proximate to residential neighborhood
- Historic preservation concerns

**NOTES**
- Narrow bounds of current site (L-shape)
- Historic house (currently parking wraps around it)
- Parking potential, but limited
- Public alleyway through site
- Adjacent Salvation Army property may expand site
- Limited visibility

### (F) Former Courthouse Block

**PRO**
- Proximate to Court/Main Street
- Courthouse owned by Plymouth Redevelopment Authority, seeking development opportunities
- Town ownership of former school/DPW buildings to the rear of block
- Good access to Route 44
- Existing public parking
  - Russell: 62
  - Old Police: 32
- Potential to combine with Probate Court Development (Site C)
- Brewster St. connection to waterfront

**CON**
- From rear of block: distance and steep slope limit transit and pedestrian/bike access
- Three residences between Courthouse and former School/DPW property
- Parking underutilized now
- Better potential use for site than parking

**NOTES**
- Study of reuse options underway
### (G) Radisson Lot

**PRO**
- Relatively flat property
- Proximate to waterfront restaurants, but does not occupy prime waterfront real estate
- Potential connections to commuter rail via MBTA right-of-way and Rail Trail
- Good replacement parking for waterfront
- Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns

**CON**
- Distance from downtown and visitor destinations for future transit options
- Good pedestrian connections
- Complicated ownership/easements

**NOTES**
- Only site outside historic district
- Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)
- Could be appealing for regional demand (seasonal & marine)
- Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and providing incentives)
- Possibility to use as engine for future development to the north

### (H) Brewster Street Lot

**PRO**
- Central location for both waterfront and downtown access
- Existing Court Street buildings, and natural grade create screening
- Partial public lot (23 spaces) and Sovereign Bank
- Access via Brewster (2-way) and North Streets

**CON**
- Somewhat distant from waterfront restaurants and Memorial Hall
- Private land may not be available
- Bank drive-through access limits development area
- Size constraints limit transit layout and bus turning movements
- Poor geometry, access, and visibility
- Potential conflict with neighbors

**NOTES**
- Partial public lot (23 spaces) and Sovereign Bank
**GATRA/Plymouth Intermodal Transit Center**

**Site Selection Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A. 1620 Restaurant/Citizens Bank</th>
<th>B. Memorial Drive</th>
<th>C. Probate Court</th>
<th>D. Main/Market Streets</th>
<th>E. Middle Street</th>
<th>F. Former Courthouse Block</th>
<th>G. Radisson Lot</th>
<th>H. Brewster Street Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACE PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>Depends on availability of whole site. Good if whole site available. Short distance from current hub</td>
<td>Currently used for GATRA bus hub Transit program could be accommodated</td>
<td>Potential site constraints for constraints for transit layout</td>
<td>Potential for on-street bus circulation Transit program limited due to small size of site</td>
<td>Not a strong transit site Transit program limited</td>
<td>Substantial building demolition likely required to accommodate transit program</td>
<td>Potential connections to commuter rail via MBTA right-of-way and Rail Trail Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns Transit program could be accommodated</td>
<td>Size constraints limit transit layout and bus turning movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to accommodate transportation program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Six (6) GATRA bus berths (4 current + 2 growth)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ One (1) additional berth (shuttles/trolleys)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Passenger waiting/ticketing area (2500 SF*)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Pick-up/drop-off/taxi area (curbside)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Pedestrian access (via sidewalks)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Bicycle facilities (200 SF, outdoors)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Staff parking spaces (incorporated into garage)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and incentives) Could be appealing for regional demand (seasonal &amp; marine) Good replacement parking for waterfront area</td>
<td>Currently used for public parking (116 spaces) Prior parking garage project proposed</td>
<td>Parking capacity could be filled by redevelopment of building Serves Main Street/Court Street area</td>
<td>Parking for Main Street area Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grist Mill, Burial Hill, Brewster Gardens</td>
<td>Parking potential, but limited</td>
<td>Existing public parking - Russell: 62 - Old Police: 32 Parking underutilized now</td>
<td>Good replacement parking for waterfront Could be appealing for regional demand (seasonal &amp; marine) Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and incentivization)</td>
<td>Partial public lot (23 spaces) and Sovereign Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required parking capacity (400-600 spaces)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown employees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown visitors – daily business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown visitors – tourism/day trips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Special Events</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER FACILITY PROGRAMMING</strong></td>
<td>Reuse of restaurant building for PPP</td>
<td>Liner buildings possible Adjacent to existing visitor’s center Supports Memorial Hall events</td>
<td>Prior public use of the site Coldwell property owners may be open to combined parking</td>
<td>Strategic location for community development Development options limited</td>
<td>Partnership with Plymouth Redevelopment Authority plans</td>
<td>Potential with surrounding uses Cordage Park access</td>
<td>Potential to work with Court Street businesses; Sovereign Bank property cooperation needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public-private or public-public partnership (PPP)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Possible co-location of PGDC (2500 SF*)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Possible co-location of Visitors (2500 SF*)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other prospective tenants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Assumed total 7500 SF basic needs in building = 50 ft x 150 ft)
Functional & Development Needs

Site Configuration & Accessibility

- Size and configuration of site
- Proximate to waterfront and Court/Main Street
- Access to key destinations in downtown area
- Quality of pedestrian environment
  - Avoid steep grades
  - Safe, visible, connections
  - Convenient connections
  - Streetscape design
- MA Access and ADA standards compliance
- Transportation Operations
  - Transit operating efficiency
  - Ease of vehicular parking access
  - Ability to encourage new riders
  - Ability to serve needs of existing customers (e.g., co-location of government or social services)
- Flexibility to accommodate future transit needs
- Traffic impacts

Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns
Could serve as a connector between waterfront and downtown
Eased access via access
High visibility enhances safety
Distance to core downtown area may limit transit use
Generally flat site overall
Supports waterfront uses

Site Configuration & Accessibility

- Proximate to waterfront and Court/Main Street
- Access to key destinations in downtown area
- Quality of pedestrian environment
  - Avoid steep grades
  - Safe, visible, connections
  - Convenient connections
  - Streetscape design
- MA Access and ADA standards compliance
- Transportation Operations
  - Transit operating efficiency
  - Ease of vehicular parking access
  - Ability to encourage new riders
  - Ability to serve needs of existing customers (e.g., co-location of government or social services)
- Flexibility to accommodate future transit needs
- Traffic impacts

Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns
Could serve as a connector between waterfront and downtown
Eased access via access
High visibility enhances safety
Distance to core downtown area may limit transit use
Generally flat site overall
Supports waterfront uses

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

- Compatibility with historic district, sites and structures
- Compatibility with surrounding land uses
- Minimal impact on environment
- Ease of environmental permitting
- Minimal site remediation required

Existing buildings provide some screening for parking
Potential to screen parking with liner buildings and existing surrounding uses
Larger massing of existing buildings is compatible with a parking structure/multimodal center

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

- Compatibility with historic district, sites and structures
- Compatibility with surrounding land uses
- Minimal impact on environment
- Ease of environmental permitting
- Minimal site remediation required

Existing buildings provide some screening for parking
Potential to screen parking with liner buildings and existing surrounding uses
Larger massing of existing buildings is compatible with a parking structure/multimodal center

DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- Ownership and ease of acquisition
- Ability to accommodate secondary uses
- Compatibility with downtown plans
- Pro-Forma performance
- Potential funding sources

Cost of privately-owned property acquisition is $4 million
Privately owned site is currently for sale
Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)
Is multimodal facility "highest and best use" of site?

Development could complete existing streetwall
Development could block viewsheds from Main St. (northbound) and John Carver line
General community support for parking

DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- Ownership and ease of acquisition
- Ability to accommodate secondary uses
- Compatibility with downtown plans
- Pro-Forma performance
- Potential funding sources

Cost of privately-owned property acquisition is $4 million
Privately owned site is currently for sale
Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)
Is multimodal facility "highest and best use" of site?

Proximate to waterfront attractions such as Mayflower Park, as well as downtown
Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grid MIL, Burial Hill, Brewster Gardens
Proximity to waterfront attractions such as Mayflower Park
Good relationship to established patterns
Small parcel size limits layout options and ability to combine transit and parking

DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- Ownership and ease of acquisition
- Ability to accommodate secondary uses
- Compatibility with downtown plans
- Pro-Forma performance
- Potential funding sources

Cost of privately-owned property acquisition is $4 million
Privately owned site is currently for sale
Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)
Is multimodal facility "highest and best use" of site?

Proximate to waterfront attractions such as Mayflower Park, as well as downtown
Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grid MIL, Burial Hill, Brewster Gardens
Proximity to waterfront attractions such as Mayflower Park
Good relationship to established patterns
Small parcel size limits layout options and ability to combine transit and parking
## GATRA/Plymouth Intermodal Transit Center
### Site Selection for Transit and Parking – Reduced Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A. 1620 Restaurant/Citizens Bank</th>
<th>B. Memorial Drive</th>
<th>C. Probate Court</th>
<th>D. Main/Market Streets</th>
<th>E. Middle Street</th>
<th>F. Former Courthouse block</th>
<th>G. Radisson Lot</th>
<th>H. Brewster Street Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT PROGRAM NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to accommodate transportation program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Six (6) GATRA bus berths (4 current + 2 growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ One (1) additional berth (shuttles/trolleys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Passenger waiting/ticketing area (2500 SF*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Pick-up/drop-off/taxi area (curbside)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Pedestrian access (via sidewalks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Bicycle facilities (200 SF, outdoors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Staff parking spaces (incorporated into garage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING PROGRAM NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required parking capacity (400-600 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown visitors – daily business</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown visitors – tourism/day trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Special Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER FACILITY PROGRAMMING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public-private or public-public partnership (PPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Possible co-location of PGDC (2500 SF*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Possible co-location of Visitors (2500 SF*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other prospective tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Assumed total 7500 SF basic needs in building = 50 ft x 150 ft)
A  Behind former 1620 restaurant with portion of Citizen’s Bank parking lot
B  Memorial Drive public parking lot
C  Behind Probate Court & adjacent Coldwell Bank parking
D  Main/Market Streets public parking lot
E  Middle Street public parking lot (below grade)
F  Former Courthouse block & Russell Street lots
G  Radisson lot
H  Brewster Street lot

**Town of Plymouth**
**Potential ITC Sites**
Site B: Memorial Drive ±
Site F: Former Courthouse block & Russell Street lots
Site H: Brewster Street lot
Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, May 31, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:30 AM
LOCATION: Harbor Room, Plymouth Town Hall

ATTENDEES:
Leighton Price, PGDC  Michael Hanlon, Fin Com
Paul Cripps, PCDC/DP  John Burke, PGDC
Donna Fernandes, PGDC  Frank Gay, GATRA
Alan Zanotti, PGDC  David Farmer, McMahon
Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse  Christi Apicella, McMahon

Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting. The summary of the 4/26/11 meeting was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and hard copies were made available. No changes to the summary were noted.

Mr. Farmer and Christi Apicella, McMahon Associates, explained that an estimate of current parking supply and demand is being prepared based on a review of existing documents. Ms. Apicella explained the study completed in 2003 by Fort Point Associates (Downtown-Waterfront Area Parking Analysis: Public Parking Development, Management and Operations) served as the starting point of the analysis. Data and methodology were updated to account for current conditions. The methodology used by McMahon is similar to that used in 2003, but expanded to review the land use categories and apply parking rates recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), and parking demand rates from the Urban Land Institute (ULI). Parking supply figures were refined with data provided by Mr. John Burke, Park Plymouth. Tourism parking demand is unique to a community so information provided by Mr. Paul Cripps, Plymouth Convention and Visitors Bureau, was used to develop parking demand ratios for use in this analysis. A summary of that methodology, as well as a summary of estimated total parking demand in the downtown Plymouth area, was distributed to the group (see attached). A summary of Parking Supply Calculations was also provided (see attached).
Based on the initial analysis, the current parking supply is estimated to be about 2,380 parking spaces (not including the Jenney lot, Waterfront 3 lot, and the Radisson parking which did not appear to have been included in the 2003 analysis). The peak hour demand for parking during the prime tourism season during the summer months is noon with a demand for 3,224 parking spaces. The demand is fairly constant between 11 am to 1 pm. This indicates the potential unmet parking demand is about 844 spaces. If the Jenny and Waterfront 3 lots are included in the supply figure, the difference is about 600 spaces, which is consistent with the findings of prior studies.

The group discussed the appropriateness of including the Waterfront 3 lot, Jenney Grist Mill lot and Radisson hotel parking in the overall downtown parking supply figures (see attached map). It was agreed that Waterfront 3 should be included due to the proximity to other waterfront parking and potential to increase use of this lot as the waterfront area develops. The Jenney Grist Mill lot will not be included due to the distance to other parking locations in the downtown area, and downtown employee reluctance to use this lot. The demand for Radisson parking is currently not included in the analysis, so the group agreed that the supply figures should not be added since the overall unmet demand will not be impacted if the Radisson supply and demand are factored into the analysis.

The group discussed the seasonal nature of parking demand in downtown Plymouth, noting that there is sufficient supply during the non-summer months. Mr. Farmer and Ms. Apicella explained that the “potential unmet demand” was a measure to determine if additional parking may be needed in downtown – it does not represent an exact number of vehicles parking illegally or circling the downtown. The unmet demand represents a typical weekday – in this case, the summer months in downtown Plymouth. Parking demand is not likely to be significantly higher than this estimate for a typical day in downtown. Demand will be much higher for certain special events (i.e., the July 4th celebration, etc.), but it is not expected that the town would attempt to provide additional downtown parking as part of this project to accommodate these special events due to the very high cost that would be involved.

It was also explained that the purpose of the parking supply/demand analysis was to base the rationale for including replacement parking as part of the multimodal transportation facility. Had the analysis shown that parking is typically underutilized, it would be difficult to make the case that parking should be included as part of the project. McMahon Associates will continue to refine the analysis and update a memo outlining the findings.

Mr. Farmer presented some concept sketches for a Multimodal Transit Center on the Courthouse Corridor (Site F). The concepts assumed that the front Courthouse building would remain in future development scenarios, but the balance of the corridor could generally be redeveloped. He also avoided using the existing green space between South Russell Street and Burial Hill. Four options were presented, keeping in mind that at least 100 feet is required to accommodate a turning GATRA bus:
1.  *Basement transit access:* This assumed an alignment that takes advantage of the slope, allowing the transit access to be in the basement level of a new building behind the Courthouse, with additional parking and/or development above.

2.  *Link to Former Registry:* This option assumes access via the Former Registry, crossing over Russell Street, to access a 2nd floor level of transit. This would require a bridge/overpass over Russell Street and presents pedestrian access challenges to reach a 2nd floor transit facility.

3.  *DPW Site:* This is an option that transverses the Courthouse Corridor, utilizing the former DPW facility and South Russell Street parking lot adjacent to Burial Hill.

4.  *Russell Parking:* This is similar to option 3, but uses the Russell Lot to the west of the former DPW, in an effort to use the top of the hill, avoid grades, and take advantage of access via Samoset Street.

The group requested that options be considered along the entire length of South Russell Street, including the existing green space between Burial Hill and the south Russell Street lot, west of School Street. There is some evidence that this area previously consisted of residential lots and is therefore separate from Burial Hill itself. It is also likely town-owned, reducing acquisition costs. McMahon will continue to develop options, consulting information available through the Courthouse Consortium and the 2007 Public Space Action Plan.

Based on the discussion, the group agreed that the primary focus should be on additional analysis of the following three sites:

- Site B (Memorial Hall)
- Site C (Former Registry)
- Site F (Courthouse Corridor)

Public input from the June 8 Public Meeting, combined with additional layouts developed for the Courthouse Corridor, will assist the Steering Committee in determining which two sites should proceed for detailed analysis.

The annotated agenda for the June 8 public meeting was distributed. The group agreed that the materials presented at the May 31 Steering Committee meeting will be useful for the public meeting. It was suggested that the need for a transit center be clearly explained. The public has generally agreed with the need for additional parking, but is less informed about the need for transit improvements for the downtown.

The next Steering Committee meeting will be held at 10:00 a.m. **Tuesday, July 12.**
Updated parking supply table for Plymouth, MA:

See attached. Does not include the three potential lots under consideration.

Tourist demand methodology for Plymouth, MA:

- 1,000,000 visitors to downtown attractions per year
- Tourist season of 5 months (150 days)
- 6667 average daily visitors
- Assumed each visitor stayed ~3 hrs. The average visitor stays in Plymouth for 4 hrs, but not all of that time is in the downtown (i.e. some time is spent at Plymouth Plantation and other non-downtown attractions).
- Assigned 6667 visitors proportionally to the various three-hour blocks based on a midday peak between 10:30AM and 3:00PM and tapering off prior and after that midday peak block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>8am to 11am</th>
<th>9am to 12pm</th>
<th>10am to 1pm</th>
<th>11am to 2pm</th>
<th>12pm to 3pm</th>
<th>1pm to 4pm</th>
<th>2pm to 5pm</th>
<th>3pm to 6pm</th>
<th>4pm to 7pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>658</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6667

- Since the three-hour blocks overlap, we then tallied up hourly accumulation (visitor volumes by hour) based on arrival and departures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8am</th>
<th>9am</th>
<th>10am</th>
<th>11am</th>
<th>12pm</th>
<th>1pm</th>
<th>2pm</th>
<th>3pm</th>
<th>4pm</th>
<th>5pm</th>
<th>6pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation (Hourly Visitors)</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reduction of 30% of visitors arriving by bus (second and third rows below)
- Hourly vehicles calculated with a factor of 3 visitors/vehicle on average\(^1\) (fourth row below, which represents the hourly parking demand for tourism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Accumulation (Hourly Visitors)</th>
<th>Bus Reduction (30% visitors on buses)</th>
<th>Adjusted Accumulation</th>
<th>Hourly Vehicles (3 visitors/vehicle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8am</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9am</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11am</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Information provided by Plymouth Convention and Visitors Bureau

Adding this into the shared parking table, we get the updated total demand (NOTE: still does not include institutional or public land uses; however, we could assume that the tourist demand covers those):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LU Code</th>
<th>10:00AM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>11:00AM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>12:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>1:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>2:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>3:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>4:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>5:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
<th>6:00PM Hourly Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family/Condos</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three/Multi Family</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket, Urban</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Market</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Store</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-in Bank, Urban</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Turnover Sit-Down</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Light Industrial</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3076</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>3224</td>
<td>3194</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Name</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront 1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront 2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront 3</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump House (Bus)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St Lot</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St Ext</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St Ext</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell St 1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell St 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in front of DPW bldg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Pond Lot</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster St Lot</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North St Lot</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Lot</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Plymouth Village Lot</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Total (public)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Landing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Village Landing</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raddison (???†)</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Total (private)</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Wharf</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other on-Street</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Total</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Changes:
- Water Street Improvements  -80
- Courthouse
- Bus Parking
Town of Plymouth
Parking Lots Under Consideration for Inclusion in Parking Supply

Waterfront Lot 3 (111)
Raddison Lot
Jenney Lot (110)
# Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

**Public Workshop**

**Wednesday, June 8, 2011**  
7:00 – 9:00 pm  
Plymouth Arts Center, 11 North Street - Russell Library Room

[Annotated] AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose: Review and discuss potential sites in downtown Plymouth to serve transit and downtown parking needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7:00** | Registration & Open House  
- Participants sign-in near entrance, pick-up agenda  
- Project Boards set up around the room for participants to view site options pro/con list  
- Consultants, GATRA, PGDC, Town reps available to answer questions |
| **7:15** | Welcome and Introduction  
- Participants take their seats (possibly set up in a semi-circle, rather than rows to make it a more informal session)  
- Frank Gay opens meetings, welcomes participants, provides an overview of the project and its goals.  
- Recognize/introduce any elected officials and other VIPs in attendance  
- Introduce Steering Committee  
- Introduce Consultants  
- Dave Farmer gives an overview of the format of the meeting (presentation with Q&A at the end) and goal for the meeting outcome (identify 2 preferred sites). Explain active participant process of non-binding “vote” for favorite options |
| **7:25** | Presentation  
- What is a Multimodal Transportation Facility?  
- Brief overview of prior studies, existing conditions  
- Overview of development program for transit, parking, multimodal  
- Present sites identified for evaluation  
- Screening criteria |
• How do sites measure up?
• Discuss process for detailed site evaluation once two sites are selected
  • Site details and environmental risk assessment
  • MEPA/NEPA
  • Traffic analysis
  • Real Estate and Finance considerations
  • Construction impacts
  • Environmental justice
  • Transit and parking demand
  • Conceptual design

7:55  Question and Answer
  • Facilitate Q&A on project goals, process, site information

8:15  Community Selection of Preferred Options
  • Distribute 2 colored dots to each participant to vote for their top two preferred sites.
  • Each participant to also note at least one reason for their vote

8:30  Reconvene & Compare Notes
  • Consultant team to summarize key findings from voting
  • Additional comments from participants

8:45  Closing Remarks
  • David Farmer – summarize next steps for consultant team; next public meeting in early fall to present detailed site analysis; remind people to sign-in so we can contact them for the next meeting
  • Frank Gay thanks participants for attending; closes meeting

9:00  Adjourn
### GATRA/Plymouth Intermodal Transit Center

**Site Selection Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A. 1620 Restaurant/Citizens Bank</th>
<th>B. Memorial Drive</th>
<th>C. Former Registry Building</th>
<th>D. Main/Market Streets</th>
<th>E. Middle Street</th>
<th>F. Courthouse Corridor</th>
<th>G. Radisson Lot</th>
<th>H. Brewster Street Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACE PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to accommodate transportation program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Six (6) GATRA bus berths (4 current + 2 growth)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ One (1) additional berth (shuttles/trolleys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Passenger waiting/ticketing area (2500 SF*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Pick-up/drop-off/taxi area (curbside)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Pedestrian access (via sidewalks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Bicycle facilities (200 SF, outdoors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Staff parking spaces (incorporated into garage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade change in combination with difficulties in land acquisition limit transit options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short distance from current bus hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently used for GATRA bus hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit program could be accommodated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential site constraints for transit layout, but possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for on-street bus circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit program limited due to small size of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit program limited due to small size of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial building demolition likely required to accommodate transit program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit program could be accommodated, but distance to downtown core limits use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential connections to commuter rail via MBTA right-of-way and Rail Trail (long-term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size constraints limit transit layout and bus turning movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required parking capacity (400-600 spaces)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown employees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown visitors – daily business</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Downtown visitors – tourism/day trips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Special Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and incentives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be appealing for regional demand (seasonal &amp; marine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good replacement parking for waterfront area if future development displaces other surface lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and incentives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently used for public parking (116 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior parking garage project proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking capacity could be filled by redevelopment of building, limiting options for net new parking supply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves Main Street/Court Street area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Main Street area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grist Mill, Burial Hill, Brewster Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking potential, but limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing public parking - Russell: 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Old Police: 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking underutilized now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good replacement parking for waterfront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be appealing for regional demand (seasonal &amp; marine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could serve as employee parking for downtown core (would require shuttle and incentives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial public lot (23 spaces) and Sovereign Bank. Difficult to expand parking without property acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER FACILITY PROGRAMMING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-private or public-public partnership (PPP)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible co-location of PGDC (2500 SF*)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible co-location of Visitors (2500 SF*)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prospective tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse of restaurant building for PPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liner buildings possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to existing visitor’s center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Memorial Hall events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior public use of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Coldwell Banker property owners may be open to combined parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic location for community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development options limited due to small size of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with Plymouth Redevelopment Authority plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential with surrounding uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Cordage Park access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to work with Court Street businesses; Sovereign Bank property cooperation needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Assumed total 7500 SF basic needs in building = 50 ft x 150 ft)
### Functional & Development Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A. 1620 Restaurant/Citizen's Bank</th>
<th>B. Memorial Drive</th>
<th>C. Former Registry Building</th>
<th>D. Main/Market Streets</th>
<th>E. Middle Street</th>
<th>F. Courthouse Corridor</th>
<th>G. Radisson Lot</th>
<th>H. Brewster Street Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE CONFIGURATION &amp; ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Size and configuration of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximate to waterfront and Court/Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to key destinations in downtown area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of pedestrian environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Avoid steep grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Safe, visible, connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Convenient connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Streetscape design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MA Access and ADA standards compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit operating efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ease of vehicular parking access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to encourage new riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to serve needs of existing customers (e.g., co-location of government or social services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility to accommodate future transit needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally flat site of existing parking, but a significant grade change for land assembly that would be required to accommodate transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established traffic patterns are compatible with bus turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong connection to Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access via Exit 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High visibility enhances safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to core downtown area may limit transit use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports waterfront uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could serve as a connector between waterfront and downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access via Route 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual grade of site supports development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple access points possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Drive is currently one-way, limiting circulation options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still some distance from Main Street shopping area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining walls on north and south property lines make site expansion difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of Russell Street limits options for bus berths, but might help stack parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow driveway to parking behind building limits circulation options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access for pedestrians/bikes from Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing on-street parking would improve traffic flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern gateway to waterfront attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to attractions such as Mayflower Park, Grist Mill, Burial Hill, Brewer Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to waterfront attractions north of Mayflower Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationship to established traffic patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small parcel size limits layout options and ability to combine transit and parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convoluted geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow bounds of current site (L-shape)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public alleyway through site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compatibility with historic district, sites and structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compatibility with surrounding land uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal impact on environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ease of environmental permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal site remediation required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing buildings provide some screening for parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of groundwater may limit construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger massing of existing buildings is compatible with a parking structure/multimodal center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the building on the Historic Register?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening with existing buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development could complete existing streetwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development could block viewsheds from Main St. (northbound) and John Carver Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some prior community support for parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential neighborhood conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic house (currently parking wraps around it); historic preservation concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three residences between Courthouse and former School/OPW property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only site outside historic district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former train depot must have site contamination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential conflict with neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of privately-owned property acquisition is $4 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately owned site is currently for sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town-owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate Court property price as much as $1.7 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land assembly extends project timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building actively being marketed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to combine with courthouse development (Site F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town-owned, currently used for parking (55 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Town Brook may limit footing/foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two prior parking structures proposed; well-studied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town-owned, currently used for parking (70 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Salvation Army property may expand site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courthouse owned by Plymouth Redevelopment Authority, seeking development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town ownership of former school/OPW buildings to the rear of block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to combine with former Registry Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated ownership/easements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to consolidate parking from water street lots and town pier area to create transit-oriented development (TOD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility to use as engine for future development to the north, Cordage Park area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private land may not be available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central location for both waterfront and downtown access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat distant from waterfront restaurants and Memorial Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access via Brewster (2-way) and North Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank drive-through access limits development area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor geometry, access, and visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5/25/11
Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, July 12, 2011
TIME: 10:00 – 11:30 AM
LOCATION: Mayflower Room, Plymouth Town Hall

ATTENDEES:

- Leighton Price, PGDC
- Lee Hartmann, Town Planner
- Dean Rizzo, PRA
- Alan Zanotti, PGDC
- Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse
- Marc Garrett, Ply PB
- John Burke, PGDC
- Joanne LaFerrara, GATRA
- David Farmer, McMahon
- Christi Apicella, McMahon

Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting. The summary of the 5/31/11 meeting was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and hard copies were made available. No changes to the summary were noted. The summary from Public Meeting #1 on June 8, 2011 will be distributed shortly – pending receipt and review of the audio file created by PGDC. The audio file will be reviewed to confirm statements made during the question and answer period.

Mr. Farmer summarized the outcome of the June 8, 2011 meeting which appeared to confirm that all potential sites in the downtown area had been identified, the pros/cons of those sites for a multimodal facility were generally accurate, and we should proceed with additional analysis of:

- Site B (Memorial Hall)
- Site C (Former Registry)
- Site F (Courthouse Corridor)

Mr. Farmer asked the group if there had been feedback regarding the June Public Meeting. Some members indicated that the general public is more aware of the Courthouse Corridor planning, than of the Multimodal Site Selection study. Abutting residents were reported to have expressed concern with the potential noise, fumes and general bus circulation near their homes in the Courthouse area. It was also reported that there is generally more acceptance of GATRA bus services than if larger inter-city buses were the primary user of the proposed Multimodal facility.
Mr. Farmer presented concepts for the Multimodal facility on Site F, the Courthouse Corridor. A series of conceptual diagrams were presented (see attached), as drawn by DHK Architects, to illustrate the progression of thought for the various transit facility layouts, ranging from layouts near the top of the hill at the Russell Street parking lots; linear orientations that occupy the entire block; to the preferred options lowest on the hill, nearest the main Courthouse building and therefore accessible to Court Street and minimal slopes for pedestrian access. Discussion about the various layout options included the following:

- Based on a review of mapping from a local engineer and MassGIS data, there is a 30-32’ grade difference from the front of the Courthouse building to the former DPW facility at the top of the hill. This presents challenges for bus and pedestrian access, but also provides an opportunity to build the facility into the grade to allow for visual screening and additional development on upper levels. Several group members expressed the need to visually screen the Multimodal facility, and some suggested subsurface options for bus bays.

- Members of the group expressed a desire to see cross section diagrams to get a better sense of the visual impact of the proposed facility than what is presented in plan view.

- There was some discussion about the need to provide transit connections to remote parking in the Route 3 corridor to ease the burden downtown. There is currently an hourly connection for all four GATRA routes to facilitate transfers. It was noted that, as discussed in previous meetings, all routes could serve the Courthouse Corridor, regardless of the location of the Multimodal Center, since all current GATRA routes travel on Court Street and pass in front of the former Courthouse.

- There is some desire for the redeveloped Courthouse Corridor to incorporate access to Burial Hill, and therefore, options that discontinue South Russell Street may restrict future development potential of the site.

- The Phase 1 study of the Courthouse Corridor is a Historic Structures Report that will identify the historic significance of the structures. The feasibility of reusing those structures or not, will follow the determination of historic significance. The Phase 2 study (not currently funded) will determine the economic development potential and feasible buildout of the corridor.

- A strong “Purpose and Need Statement” must be developed for the Multimodal Site Selection project that reflects the other uses, such as visitor/tourism services, economic and community development, etc. A key question to answer “Is the Multimodal facility critical to the future development of the Courthouse Corridor?” John Burke mentioned
potential “Livability” grants through the Federal government that incorporate these issues.

- There may be geotechnical considerations that would need to be addressed before concepts are significantly advanced. The environmental features are often the determining factor of feasible development options.

- The group generally agreed that diagrams C, J, M warranted additional analysis. The group also agreed that efforts should be made to preserve access via South Russell Street to allow for potential frontage of future development toward Burial Hill [subsequent discussions with committee members and consultants working on the Courthouse Corridor Historic Structures Report indicate that reduced access and/or a realigned South Russell Street could be considered].

Mr. Farmer asked about the group’s thoughts on continuing to evaluate Site C – Former Registry Building. Based on the assessed value of the former Registry Building, value of adjacent properties, and the need to replace existing private parking, the estimated cost of acquisition could be as high as $10 million. This estimated cost is based on assessed values of the Former Registry Site and the Coldwell Banker property of $3.35 million multiplied by a factor of 2.5 for planning purposes. Considering that the remaining two sites are already in public ownership, it would be difficult to justify the additional cost of acquisition of this site for the multimodal center. The group agreed it should be dropped from further consideration.

Due to some confusion by the media and general public regarding what a “Multimodal” facility is and what it means for the community, it was suggested that the project name should be modified to more accurately represent the goals of the project. Suggestions such as “Transportation and Information Center,” “Welcome Center” and other names with a tourism/visitor/economic development focus were made. The group is encouraged to think about options that could help “brand” the project and send ideas to McMahon Associates.

The next Steering Committee meeting will be held at 10:00 a.m. **Tuesday, August 30.** The approach to the second public meeting, targeted for the end of September, will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.
Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting. The summary of the 7/13/11 meeting was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and hard copies were made available. No additions or corrections to the summary were noted.

Mr. Farmer explained that working sessions have been held with the Courthouse Consortium to further evaluate options for Site F – Courthouse Corridor. Discussions and conceptual drawings focused on how the three desired program elements (1) transit, (2) parking, and (3) commercial development could be accommodated on the site. In general, any two of the three program elements can be made to fit on the site, with the third program element suffering from a lack of available space.

A series of conceptual diagrams were distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting (see attached). Drawings F5 and F6 were used to focus discussion on Site F. The concepts comply with the 35 foot height restriction required by zoning. There was some discussion about potential flexibility in determining overall height, but the group generally agreed with the approach that potential development should not be so tall that it overwhelms the original courthouse building. The group’s discussion regarding the concepts generally included the following:
• Concepts that allow for parking and transit to dominate the site are not consistent with the desire to adaptively reuse the site for commercial, retail, and housing.

• Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is unlikely to fund parking that is not needed for transit use, and is not replacement parking required for mitigation for building a transit facility that displaces parking.

• Maximum transit service should be provided to and from the Courthouse. It was acknowledged that good transit connectivity could be provide to the Courthouse if a bus stop with frequent service were established at Court Street in front of Court Square.

• Court Square itself should have a pedestrian focus. The group generally did not support bus berths or vehicular parking directly in front of the original courthouse building. However, as noted above, a bus stop on Court Street was considered very beneficial.

• New commercial development in the Courthouse Corridor will require parking, decreasing the total net new parking to service downtown Plymouth that could otherwise be constructed on Site F.

• Geotechnical and historic preservation issues may constrain development options.

The group also discussed concepts for Site B – Memorial Drive:
• The relatively flat site allows for more options for transit layout and flat plates for parking in upper levels.

• Access to commercial buildings between Park Drive and the Memorial Hall parking area should be maintained. Loading issues should also be considered for these uses, and Memorial Hall

• There are opportunities to incorporate a pedestrian corridor that links the waterfront and downtown via development of the Memorial Drive parking area for transit, parking, and commercial/tourism use.

• Ground-level commercial with pedestrian access should be a key component of the development.

• The potential for subsurface parking was mentioned, but its probable high cost was noted. A facility could potentially be constructed with footings that would allow for additional building height to be added as a future phase.
• It was noted that prior parking structure proposals for the site were not advanced due to withdrawal of the proposals by the developer – there was no specific opposition to the prior proposals.

The group generally agreed that:
1. The full development program for the Multimodal Center is not possible on Site F without jeopardizing future development potential envisioned for the Courthouse Corridor.

2. Efforts should be focused on developing options for Site B, Memorial Hall.

Due to some confusion by the media and general public regarding what a “Multimodal” facility is and what it means for the community, it was suggested that the project name should be modified to more accurately represent the goals of the project. Suggestions included:
• Transportation and Visitors Center
• Hub
• Concourse
• Memorial Hall Transportation Center

Future meetings are anticipated as follows:
• **Update the Board of Selectmen, Tuesday, October 18th.**

• Public Meeting #2 will follow the Selectmen meeting (date to be determined). The presentation will be similar to that given to the Board of Selectmen on 10/18/11, as well as a summary of case studies from other communities.

• The next Study Steering Committee meeting will be scheduled following Public Meeting #2. **An October Study Steering Committee meeting will not be held.**
NOTES:
1. ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
2. CATRA REVIEW PENDING
3. PARKING LEVELS CAN BE ADDED TO INCREASE CAPACITY
4. EMERGENCY EGRESS AND FIRE SEPARATION RESOLV'S NOT
   RESOLVED AT THIS STAGE

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - 8/18/2011
OPTION F4: UNDERGROUND BERTHS
WITH COMMERCIAL AND PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 1 PLAN
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - 8/18/2011

OPTION F4: UNDERGROUND BERTHS WITH COMMERCIAL AND PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 2 PLAN
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - 8/18/2011

OPTION F4: UNDERGROUND BERTHS WITH COMMERCIAL AND PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 3 PLAN
NOTES:
1. ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
2. CATPA REVIEW PENDING
3. PARKING LEVELS IN PHASE-2 SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES
4. EMERGENCY EGRESS AND FIRE SEPARATION REG'S NOT RESOLVED AT THIS STAGE

OPTION F-5: UNDERGROUND BERTHS WITH COMMERCIAL AND PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL ONE
OPTION F-5: UNDERGROUND BERTHS WITH COMMERCIAL AND PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL TWO
NOTES:
1. SOUTH RUSSELL STREET DEDICATED TO BUSWAY
2. ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
3. EMERGENCY EGRESS AND FIRE SEPARATION REQ'S NOT RESOLVED AT THIS STAGE
Parking Count

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-street</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-site</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing displaced</td>
<td>31 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>181 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net add</td>
<td>150 (=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES:
1. ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
2. EMERGENCY EGRESS AND FIRE SEPARATION REQ'S NOT RESOLVED AT THIS STAGE

F6  UNDERGROUND BERTHS
WITH PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 1 PLAN

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - 9/6/2011
### Parking Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-street</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-site</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing displaced</td>
<td>26 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>166 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net add</td>
<td>140 (=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - 9/6/2011**

**F6** UNDERGROUND BERTHS WITH PARKING ABOVE

**LEVEL 2 PLAN**
Parking Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-street</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-site</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing displaced</td>
<td>26 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>154 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net add</td>
<td>128 (=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION - 9/6/2011

F1 AT-GRADE BERTHS WITH PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 2, 3 PLAN
NOTES:
1. ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
2. EMERGENCY EGRESS AND FIRE SEPARATION REQS NOT RESOLVED AT THIS STAGE

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION – 9/6/2011
TRANSIT AT GROUND LEVEL WITH PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 1 PLAN
## Parking Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-site</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing displaced</td>
<td>142 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>300 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net add</td>
<td>158 (=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram:**

- **MEMORIAL DRIVE**
- **WATER STREET**
- *Transit at Ground Level with Parking Above*

**Scale:**

- 0 50' 100'
NOTES:
1. ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
2. EMERGENCY EGRESS AND FIRE SEPARATION REQ'S NOT RESOLVED AT THIS STAGE

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION – 9/6/2011

B3 TRANSIT AT GROUND LEVEL WITH PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 1 PLAN
### Parking Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing on-site</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing displaced</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>312 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net add</td>
<td>170   (=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION – 9/6/2011

**B3** TRANSIT AT GROUND LEVEL WITH PARKING ABOVE

LEVEL 2, 3 PLAN

---

MEMORIAL DRIVE

WATER STREET

---
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Site Selection Study for Plymouth Multimodal Transportation Facility

Study Steering Committee

Progress Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, March 13, 2012
TIME: 10:00 – 11:30 AM
LOCATION: Mayflower Room, Plymouth Town Hall
ATTENDEES:

Leighton Price, PGDC
Lee Hartmann, Town Planner
Donna Fernandes, PGDC
Michael Hanlon, Fin Com
Alan Zanotti, PGDC
Larry Rosenblum, Courthouse
Mark Stankiewicz, Town Manager

Michelle McCarthy, Park Plymouth
John Burke, PGDC
Fran Gay, GATRA
Patrick O’Brien, Town of Plymouth
David Farmer, McMahon
Christi Apicella, McMahon
Chris Anzuoni, Plymouth & Brockton

Meeting Summary

David Farmer, McMahon Associates, opened the meeting.

Leighton Price, PGDC, introduced Michelle McCarthy. Ms. McCarthy is the new director of Park Plymouth. John Burke will continue to be involved with PGDC to help advance the Plymouth Transportation Center project.

Mr. Farmer provided a summary of past meetings, included the last Steering Committee in September 2011. He reminded the group that there was general agreement at that meeting that Site B – Memorial Drive is the most viable site for the proposed Plymouth Transportation Center. Mr. Farmer also indicated that the project team provided a project update presentation to the Board of Selectmen October 18, 2011, and held a Public Meeting in December 6, 2011. There have also been coordination meetings with Town officials and property owners adjacent to the proposed project site.

Mr. Farmer explained that since the last Steering Committee meeting, the project team has been looking at what can fit on the site, and reviewed options for site orientation that can be grouped as follows (please see attached “Memorial Drive Parking Lot Configurations/Sub-options Examined”):

- Longitude
The transverse options assume additional property acquisition, such as the Ming restaurant. The advantage of this site layout is the potential for access from Park Avenue, but there are visual impacts of ramps and the back of buses facing Park Street. The Federal Transit Agency (FTA) is unlikely to pay for the acquisition of land because other options for siting the facility are available. The group generally agreed that the transverse options do not appear to justify the cost and effort that would be required.

The group discussion included the following:

- Overall transit circulation should be considered in the context of roadways in neighborhoods. The travel time impacts of a circular bus route should be considered in design.

- It is unlikely that an easement exists for traffic to access the site from Park Avenue toward Memorial Drive. The impacts of property acquisition (entire parcel vs. an easement) should be considered.

- General concepts should be reviewed with the Plymouth Historic Commission before design concepts advance.

- The parking structure should be designed so that potential future air rights development is not precluded, and column spacing is established in a way that allows for vertical expansion in the future. The structure should also include varied massing to reduce visual impacts from Court and Water Streets. It was noted that air rights development would exceed the current 35-foot height limitation.

- Additional building space could help subsidize the cost of structured parking, but it also increases the parking demand for the site.

- There is a desire by some members of the group for the Transportation Center to serve as a gateway site to transit, a visitor center and other downtown development. A pedestrian passage should be incorporated in the design to link the Court Street area to the waterfront.

- Access points for buses and vehicles for parking should be kept separate. Access to Memorial Hall for loading and deliveries should be considered in the design.

- Some concern was raised about potential conflicts for parking in the new facility with special events at Memorial Hall.
Mr. Farmer mentioned that the final design process will address many of these details, once this Site Selection Study is complete. Conceptual design has been developed to the extent to determine site feasibility and there are many details that will be addressed as the project moves forward.

The group also discussed the desire to enhance the waterfront by relocating existing surface parking to the Transportation Center so that land could be converted to a higher use. It was also mentioned that parking garage access via Water Street is less desirable from a visual perspective.

Christi Apicella, McMahon Associates, provided a brief overview of the environmental review process for the project, indicating that local historic commission discussion is the first step. An informal meeting could be arranged with the state agency (MEPA), followed by the national process (NEPA) with the FTA.

The group agreed that informal meetings with key stakeholders and updating relevant Town Boards and Committees are important for the project to proceed.
Memorial Drive Parking Lot
Configurations/Sub-options Examined

Configurations

Facility transverse to lot
- Access to facility from South Park Avenue
- Reduced massing of structure on Memorial Drive

Facility directly over footprint of lot
- No property acquisition required

Sub-options (for each configuration above)

Structure overhangs Water Street development parcel
- Absolutely maximizes parking spaces

Water Street development parcel left open
- Maximizes attractiveness of Water Street parcel to developers

Summary Conclusions

Transverse Configurations
1. Transverse options would require more complex negotiations and additional expenses.
2. Expenses do not appear to justify effort.
3. Ventilation for buses and/or less desirable presence of buses on South Park Avenue.

Structure overhanging Water Street parcel
1. Additional expense in isolating developable area from garage.
2. Reduced ability for creative development (and value) of parcel.
3. Anticipated negative response for historical district.

Considerations for remaining option (non-overhanging, longitudinal configuration)
1. Allow space for access to loading area at rear of Memorial Hall.
2. Provide best accommodations for neighbors, possibly
   a. Landscaped plaza north of structure
   b. At-grade parking within structure
   c. Additional signage.
3. Provide space for visitor information in southeast corner of site.
4. Examine additional at-grade parking between Al’s Pizza and development parcel.