

DRAFT

TOWN OF MEDWAY

ROUTE 109 PROJECT COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, March 20, 2013, 7:00 PM

Medway Town Hall – Sanford Hall

155 Village Street

Medway, MA 01053

Present:

Paul Yorkis, Chair of the Committee

Andy Espinosa, Board of Selectman

Dan Hooper

Chan Rogers

Ann Sherry

Matt Buckley

Suzy Affleck-Childs, Planning and Economic Development Coordinator

Geoffrey Howie – Greenman-Pendersen, Inc.

John Diaz – Greenman-Pendersen, Inc.

Sean Sanger – Copley Wolff Design Group

Mr. Yorkis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Entrance to Choate Park – Mr. Yorkis gave a brief overview of the Choate Park Access Drive regarding how traffic would be affected by a change in the access way. Mr. Howie and Mr. Diaz presented a Powerpoint of the alternatives of the access drive to Choate Park. The detailed plans provided three options for changing the access way. The *first alternative* would create a new intersection on Main St/Rt. 109 to connect to Oak Street/Choate Park with sidewalk on one side only. Mr. Hooper inquired as to the length of the connection, which would be about 100 feet. There is also a proposed crosswalk from the South side to the North side across Main St. Inquiries were made regarding safety measures but the State would need to pay for any additional measures taken besides those already included in the plan (curbs, guardrails, etc.) Concerns were raised over high school students using the access way as a cut-through on the way to/from school. Mr. Buckley addressed concerns about safety, and that the Town should not pass up an opportunity to have the State create an entrance, and that beyond that the Town would need to then create/fund additional safety measures. Concerns were raised over safety issues and what the timeframe would be for those concerns to be addressed within the Town. Mr. Yorkis explained the intersection of Main/Highland/Milford is being totally resigned to diminish the traffic at that intersection, and it will now include three lanes. The administration of the Town will need to collectively come up with alternative designs to make Oak Street safer with the introduction of the access way to Choate Park. Jill Antonellis requested a proactive public notice (i.e. mailing) to be notified prior to those meetings regarding safety measures. Karen from Conservation Commission explained that there cannot be two sidewalks due to the proximity to Chicken Brook. The Thayer Committee has already been in discussion regarding connecting a sidewalk or pathway to make the area more 'walkable' and pedestrian friendly. The *second*

DRAFT

45 *alternative* would include moving the proposed intersection closer to the Medway mills, and the
46 *third alternative* would be moving the intersection East, away from Chicken Brook. The
47 anticipated impact on the area would be about two years for the entire project.

48
49 Mr. Diaz also presented options for pedestrian traffic lights including the Hawk System is a
50 pedestrian system that has the pedestrian walk/don't walk with an overhead structure to control
51 traffic. Mass DOT has approved this signal, but there are none installed Massachusetts yet. The
52 second signal option is the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) which includes a strobe
53 light that activates when the button is pushed. However, the RRFB does not have any traffic
54 control lights.

55
56 Mr. Yorkis wrapped up discussion and reminded everyone in attendance to sign in so they may
57 be informed of the next meeting.

58
59 **Mr. Espinosa motioned to have the Route 109 Committee accept Alternative 1 for the Choate**
60 **Park access way, Dan seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.**

61
62 **Mr. Espinosa also motioned that the Committee endorse the Hawk System signals to be**
63 **installed at Choate Park, Ms. Sherry seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.**

64
65 Traffic Lights and Street Lights Designs – Options of lighting were presented to the Town by ((guy
66 in the sweater)). The first option, which would be 20-22" tall, is a full cut off fixture such as the
67 Sternberg 1527. The advantage to this fixture is that the height allows these fixtures to be more
68 spread out. However, these fixtures do make the environment feel more like a roadway and less
69 like a pedestrian walkway. The benefit of a full cut off fixture is that light can be directed down
70 or horizontally and will reduce light spillage. The second option is the pendant light, or a near cut
71 off, such as the Sternberg 880. These fixtures do have a little spillage. These lights are typically
72 about 16-18" feet and are spaced about 60-80" feet apart. There was a brief presentation on the
73 pole options that can be added to the fixtures. Additional options include street signs, banners,
74 and power outlets can be added to the poles. The layout for these fixtures would be staggered
75 on both sides of the street.

76
77 Traffic signal structure options include fluted poles, standard poles, ornamental bases, and paint
78 colors. All poles can be constructed and painted to meet Mass DOT standards. The decorative
79 poles are typically found in historical districts, but are about twice the cost of the standard signal
80 poles. The Committee engaged in discussion regarding the cost of standard Mass DOT poles and
81 the cost that would be incurred by the Town if decorative poles were installed. Cost is dependent
82 on selection of bulbs, fixtures, and how elaborate the poles are, however street lights are
83 included in this project. The state can, however, reject the lights we choose based upon costs.
84 The Committee agrees that the price per fixture needs to be determined prior to the next
85 meeting so that the selection and options can be narrowed down and a decision can be made.
86 That decision will then be passed on to the Planning Board.

87

DRAFT

88 **Mr. Espinosa motioned that the Town purchase standard black traffic signals, with the**
89 **exception of historical areas and Winthrop Street, which will be decorative traffic signals. Ms.**
90 **Sherry seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.**

91

92 The Committee is in agreement that Sean will attend the next meeting with examples and
93 locations of both standard and arm fixtures that members can view on their own time.

94

95 Possible relocation of Eastern Traffic Signal in Business District – As a result of the proposed Tri-
96 Valley Commons development between Charles River Bank and Papa Ginos, a request by the
97 applicant has been made to change the location of the Eastern Traffic Signal. The signal would
98 be moved about 150-200 to allow access to the Commons and the preliminary conceptual plan
99 was reviewed in detail. The Planning Board and their Traffic Consultant are reviewing how this
100 would affect the Western Traffic signal. Analysis of traffic flow and parking has already been
101 completed, and the Committee is in agreement that any other analysis will need be funded by
102 the surrounding business (Medway Plaza) in the areas near the signals. GPI is in agreement that
103 moving the Western signal, the Route 109 project will be directly affected, however moving the
104 Eastern signal will not make a significant negative impact. Mass DOT has approved the signals as
105 proposed by GPI, but also knows there is a proposal before the Committee to move the signal(s).
106 The Committee is in agreement that the Tri-Valley Commons project is paramount, and must be
107 moved forward based on the original analysis provided to the Committee.

108

109 **Mr. Rogers motioned to support the relocation of the Eastern traffic light as proposed by the**
110 **Tri-Valley applicant, contingent upon additional analysis paid for by the applicant and**
111 **favorably reviewed by GPI. Mr. Espinosa seconded the motion. By a vote of (4) four in favor,**
112 **(0) zero opposed, and (2) two abstained the motion was approved.**

113

114 Possible relocation of Western Traffic Signal in Business District – **Mr. Espinosa motioned that**
115 **the Western signal remain designated as originally designed by GPI , with the opportunity that**
116 **the owner of the Medway Shopping Center can provide a plan for an alternative traffic signal**
117 **location. Mr. Rogers seconded. By a vote of (5) five in favor, (0) zero opposed, and (1) abstaining**
118 **the motion was approved.**

119

120 **Ms. Sherry motioned to adjourn at 10:45pm, Mr. Rogers seconded, and the motion was**
121 **unanimously approved.**

122

123 *Next meeting date: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 in Sanford Hall*