



Meeting Notes

Place: Go To Meeting

Date: June 22, 2020

Notes Taken by: Tracie Lenhardt

Project #: 12984.00

Re: 608164 – BFRT - Sudbury

ATTENDEES

Beth Suedmeyer – Town of Sudbury	Tracie Lenhardt – VHB	Dimitrios Makos – D3
Lori Capone – Town of Sudbury	Paul Nauyokas – VHB	Adolade Campbell – D3
Dan Nason- Town of Sudbury	Keith Wenners - VHB	Eamon Kernan - MassDOT PM
Bill O'Rourke – Town of Sudbury		Ann Sullivan– D3
Adam Dechesneau – Town of Sudbury		Robert Tong – Boston Traffic

The first Comment Resolution Meeting (CRM) was held on May 6, 2020 but a second meeting related to traffic comments was held on June 22, 2020. The discussions were related to the proposed Hybrid Beacons (HAWK) at Hudson Road (Rte 27) at Peakham Road and on North Road (Rte 117).

Hudson Rd (Rte 27) at Peakham Rd:

Both District and Boston were concerned with the all approaching legs of the intersection being able to see the signal heads for the HAWK when activated. District and Boston Traffic thought that a full traffic signal might be the most appropriate measure for this location. VHB noted that a signal warrant analysis was performed for this location at the 25% Design stage and a sketch of proposed signal was prepared and presented in the FDR. VHB to send a pdf of the signal to all on this call.

At the 25% Design Submission, the intersection had the required traffic volumes to meet Warrant 3 but the result of Warrant 1 was unknow because an 8-hour weekday count was not conducted and Warrant 2 was only met using information from a traffic study for a proposed development in Sudbury Center, so in turn, a HAWK was proposed instead of a full traffic signal. District and VHB agree that most likely the intersection meets the Warrant 1 (Eight Hour Vehicular Volume) but counts cannot be taken due to COVID-19. The Town of Sudbury noted that DPW is in favor of a traffic signal at this location but would need to investigate this further with the Town. The concept signal prepared by VHB will need to be modified so that at least one overhead signal per approach is provided. Boston Traffic also mentioned that if the Town does want ornamental mast-arms to match the one in Town Center, the Town will have to justify the reasons why non-standard mast arms are not used, reasons can be such as historical area or CBD, etc. Otherwise, the Town will have to pay the cost difference between the special mast arm and the standard mast arms. Prior to the 75% design submission, additional traffic counts will be required



North Rd (Rte 117):

It was agreed that a HAWK is the appropriate traffic measure at this trail crossing. District noted that it had previously agreed to shift the westerly stop line closer to the crosswalk to block drivers exiting left out of the driveway to walking trails. The proposed stop line should be no closer than 40' to the signal head. For the 75% Design, the mast arm should be shift westerly along with the stop line. A pedestrian post will be required for the trail users to cross.

The following are the 25% comments that generated the discussions:

Boston Traffic:

1. Sheet 56 - Only one signal head for the Peakham Road approach?
2. Sheet 56 - According to the FDR Pg 19, Rte 27/Peakham Road intersection meets warrant 2 and 3, does the town expressed desire a full signal?
3. General - Consideration should be given to reviewing the crash data in more detail along Hudson Road as it was identified as having a rate higher than the state average for its functional class. Are there existing safety issues near the trail crossing that could be exacerbated by the addition of a trail crossing?

District Traffic:

1. Sheet 56 - The District is concerned with the control of the trail crossing at the intersection of Hudson Road (Route 27) and Peckham Road. Please consider moving the trail crossing to the east so that the stop line on Hudson EB is east of Peckham Road. Also, provide signage to ensure that the motorists on the side streets /driveways understand the right of way when the HAWK is activated.
2. Sheet 56 - Any concerns with proximity of intersecting driveways to pedestrian hybrid beacon?
3. Sheet 71 - It does not appear that the proposed Hybrid Beacon will be visible to vehicles at the existing driveway opening.