

There is a concept behind the new Generals Bridge. Honest.

How well then was the concept then evolved into actual concrete, pavement, traffic flow, and traffic signalization, however, is a whole other matter.

In any event, key understanding the rationale for building the Generals Bridge is that it is primarily provide an additional access way to the somewhat new 675 +/- garage parking spaces sorta/kinda near the Quincy District Courthouse as well as to upwards of a couple thousand more garage parking spaces to be built if and when more development actually happens in and around where the Ross Garage used to be.

In other words, the goal is to spread around the traffic in and out of Quincy Center onto Burgin Parkway or Granite Street to Quarry Street across three bridges rather than the current and often congested two – the Paul Harold Bridge that services Hannon Parkway Bridge (once known as "The Bridge to Nowhere") and the Granite Street bridge over the MBTA's tracks next to the Stop & Shop corporate offices building.

While the underlying transportation flow mathematically modeling is complicated, the goal is that by moving around some modest fraction of the current traffic heading into and out of Quincy Center away from Hannon and Granite should mitigate the impact of traffic on Burgin Parkway, Hannon Parkway, Granite Extension, and Granite Street given the anticipated redevelopment within Quincy Center – given properly timing traffic signalization among a number of traffic signals for multiple intersections, that is.

Even so, a fair question is just how many millions of tax dollars were spent to dress up the Generals Bridge with granite cladding and other extravagant design features on what is ultimately but a simple overpass over MBTA tracks that connects to what is ultimately but a short side street alleyway that provides an ALTERNATIVE access way to and from potentially as many as a couple thousand or so mostly garage parking spaces that are most likely to be variously subsidized by taxpayers mostly for the benefit of koched-up connected developers.

And in answer to your final question, the only one way in (coming in from Burgin while heading north) onto the Generals Bridge and the only way out (taking a right onto Burgin northbound while coming out) was planned so as to endeavor to mitigate backing up traffic on Burgin that would occur given more time consuming traffic signalization that would facilitate all ways in and out egress at the Generals Bridge and Burgin Parkway intersection.

At the same time, however, there appear to be potentially fatal design flaws with the limited egress approach that looks to be implemented at the Generals Bridge and Burgin Parkway intersection.

Specifically, it appears that at least some of run of through traffic northbound on Burgin between the Paul Harold and Granite Street bridges will be reduced from two to one lane of traffic as one of the current two lanes will be converted to right turn only onto the Generals Bridge.

Additionally, it appears that there will be but limited shoulders along the side of where Burgin is to be reconfigured given its intersection with the Generals Bridge.

Likely resultant problems include creating a traffic bottleneck, if not also increasing the incidence of accidents.

For example, drivers as well as snowplows surely ending up plowing into and onto the new sidewalk [bumpout](#) that has been built to physically limit traffic from two lanes of traffic down to but one lane of traffic for a short run on Burgin Parkway for northbound through traffic after passing Burgin's intersection with the Generals' bridge.

So what, apparently, for the fact that the new sidewalk along Burgin not only does not go anywhere, it will likely also bait at least some pedestrians to walk on the pavement of Burgin Parkway to reach Burgin's intersection with Granite Street.

Net/net, the whole of things is akin to [what happens when one tasks a committee larded up with Kochsters to design a camel.](#)