

DRAFT

Sudbury Center Improvement Advisory Committee  
Minutes  
March 22, 2010

PRESENT: Scott Carpenter, Rich Davison, Eva MacNeill, Frank Riepe, Joe Sziabowski, Jan Hardenbergh (filling in for Deborah Kruskal), Larry O'Brien, Bill Place, Jody Kablack

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm.

The new consultants, Traffic Solutions, were in attendance to present their findings and concepts after reviewing the planning work done by the Cecil Group and SEA. Jody Kablack gave a brief overview of the history of the project over the last 3 years, stressing the need to complete the project as the traffic signals in the Town Center are malfunctioning:

April 2007 – Town Meeting voted design funds, \$100,000

April 2008 – hired surveying firm of Horsley & Witten

Jan 2009 - Survey complete

March 2009 –RFP for new engineering firm

April 2009 – Interviewed firms

July 2009 - Hired Traffic Solutions

January 2010 – new concept sketches presented

Selectmen O'Brien noted that the Board of Selectmen wants to move forward with the project. While they hope that agreement can be found as to which alternative is best, if the process stalls again the Town will be forced to just replace the lights and install curbing.

Richard Benevento from Traffic Solutions described what he views are the major issues the Town is facing regarding this project: preservation of the character of the historic center, the need to move traffic through the intersection without creating an unsightly highway, extreme dislike of ugly mast arm signal posts and other highway infrastructure and sensitivity to the abutting properties. He feels that his firm has made progress on alternatives that address the major issues but still create a safer intersection. These are only concepts, but agreement is needed so that the plans can be refined and a design engineered.

Jim Fitzgerald from Traffic Solutions described the data collection that they performed. There were errors in the data collected from SEA, and all turning movement data had to be recounted. The peak hours are 7-9 am and 4-6 pm on weekdays, eastbound on Hudson Road heaviest in the am hours and westbound on Hudson Road in the pm hours. Accident data compiled by the Sudbury Police Dept. indicates 52 accidents in the 3 full calendar years 2005-2007. This is 2-3 times the state average for similar, signalized intersections. The deficiencies they see in the current intersection configuration are (1) alignment (both

## DRAFT

east/west and north/south), (2) lack of signal visibility and (3) lack of directional signals. Jim then described the alternatives that they have designed.

### Alternative 2 – Four legged intersection

This alternative maintains the current intersection patterns but adds lanes where needed (right turn lane added southbound on Concord Road, right turn lane added eastbound on Hudson Road). This alternative improves alignment in both directions, updates the traffic signals, improves the level of service from F to D, and reduces current queues but does not eliminate them. The no-name roadway in front of Town Hall becomes one way heading north, with curbside parallel parking. Raised islands are added throughout the intersection to install post mounted signals. There is no encroachment into the First Parish property except for temporary grading.

### Comments from SCIAC members:

There are some concerns for pavement markings

The one-way aspect of the no-name road is a concern

How is the entrance to the Town Hall parking affected?

There appears to be some reconfiguration to the Town Common with this plan

Has the turning radius for trucks been verified –yes

Jim then described the phasing for the lights. They would be actuated by vehicle detection. The lights would proceed to the next phase if cars are not detected in any specific lane in the intersection.

### Alternative 4A – Offset intersection

This alternative creates 2 signalized intersections in the area which would be coordinated and operate as 1 intersection. Level of service will increase from F to D. Operationally the intersection will function similarly to the other alternative. Queue length will decrease slightly from 74 cars (currently) to 28 cars (Alt. 2) to 24 cars (Alt. 4A).

### Comments from SCIAC members:

There appears to be good opportunity for parking in the center

This configuration may significantly impact the Majno's property

Are the cost estimates accurate? It seems like Alt. 4A would be more expensive.

This plan segregates Town Hall and Grange from the Common

Seems like we will be demolishing the Town Center to build something new

There are too many places where there are 4 lanes of traffic

Needs more pedestrian opportunities

The plan will look better with landscape architecture added.

How will this impact the perception of the historic town center in the future?

Is the plan too grandiose? Will we run the risk like the Police Station plan?

### Next Steps:

- Traffic Solutions will add more crosswalks and walkways to the plans
- Bill Place will verify cost estimates for construction

DRAFT

- There are no cost estimates for the enhancements – lighting, signage, plants, public amenities
- First Parish will hold a congregational meeting on June 7 to discuss these plans
- Review both plans at a Board of Selectmen meeting – J.Kablack to set up

J. Kablack asked if it was agreed that we can move forward with one of these 2 plans, and there was general consensus that we can.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.