

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

JOHN BETHONEY, CHAIR
CHARLIE PACKER, P.E. VICE CHAIR
DIMITRIA SULLIVAN
DANIEL O'NEIL
JACK KELIHER



JASON MAMMONE, P.E.
DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING

JOSEPH FLANAGAN
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

MICHAEL D'ENTREMONT
CHIEF OF POLICE

KRISTEN MORSE
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

DEDHAM TOWN HALL
450 WASHINGTON ST
DEDHAM, MA 02027
www.dedham-ma.gov

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
Remote participation via ZOOM
Tuesday, December 13, 2022 – 7 PM.

Present: John Bethoney, Chair
Charlie Packer, P.E. Member
Dimitria Sullivan, SB
Jack Kelliher, Member

Jason Mammone, P.E., Director of Engineering
Michael D'Entremont, Chief of Police

Absent: Dan O'Neil, Member

Mr. John Bethoney opened the meeting at 7:00 PM and reviewed the virtual meeting guidelines and protocols.

A roll call attendance was taken- above listed TAC members were present.

Agenda Item # 1 – Traffic Calming Request #2021-001, Colburn Street (Curve St. to Maverick St.): Jean Connally (Applicant)

Mr. Jason Mammone summarized the documents in front of committee which was a draft ballot similar ones used in the past for Traffic Calming Requests. The Description describes everything that has been done up to date and explains what the traffic calming policy requires in terms of response and approval rates. The ballot itself has some general questions that asks if the measures installed were useful or if it showed no changes. Most importantly a question was added on whether residents would like to see Speed Humps or Cushions placed permanently. A note is attached to remind them that if they are approved the NO PARKING RESTRICTION will remain in effect permanently due to emergency response purposes.

Last page always has open feedback where anybody can add comments or concerns as it pertains to this trial period. I would like to bring it back to the Chairman or the committee to see if anyone has any questions or changes.

Mr. Bethoney: I have one request before going to the members. Could you explain the thresholds as outlined in Paragraph 3 of the cover letter.

Mr. Mammone: To coincide with the ballots we need receive 75% approval from property owners that live on the primary roadway which is Colburn and 60% in favor of making traffic calming measures permanent on Maverick, Curve, Hersh, Gould, Denmark. If those thresholds are not met it means that the neighborhood is not in favor of the Traffic Calming Measures. Everything would be removed and brought back to the pre-existing conditions. It is important to have the Super Majority in favor because it does change the fabric of the roadway system. An unreturned ballot is recorded as a no vote. Therefore, it is very important that the ballot be returned. The ballot is sent with a self-addressed stamped envelope with ample of amount of time to be returned.

Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone had any questions or comments on the cover letter?

Ms. Sullivan was recognized by the Chair. She commented that she had some suggestions to the letter, but nothing that changed the policy of the letter. She will send by email. Mr. Mammone had no problem with this request.

Mr. Bethoney moved to the Ballot itself and asked if anyone had any questions or comments on items Page 1, Paragraphs 1-6? Heard None. Paragraphs 7 and the Closing? Heard None.

Ballots will be sent after January 1st and have 4 weeks turnaround time.

Motion - A motion was made by Mrs. Sullivan to approve the Cover Letter notwithstanding minor clerical changes as presented by Jason Mammone. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kelliher, and a roll call vote was taken

A roll call vote was taken:

Charlie Packer -	Yes
Dimitria Sullivan -	Yes
Jack Kelliher -	Yes
John Bethoney -	Yes

The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

The Chair asked that Mr. Mammone send final copy of Cover Letter to TAC Members for records.

Discussion: Curve Street Letter

Mr. Bethoney: We received a recent letter from residents of Curve St. voicing their concerns on the matter that temporary speed cushions would be installed due to a traffic evaluation requested by a resident. This letter dated 11/28/22 and since then has been updated to include more signatures. The Chair has invited Mrs. Burns and any other neighbor who would like to be heard to be present here at tonight's meeting. The concern does not seem to be to debate a traffic issue as it relates to speed, volume, accidents but more towards the traffic mitigations proposed and the speed cushions. The signors are asking for other mitigation measures before the board makes any decisions. Although Mr. Bethoney has explained to Mrs. Burns that decision has been made. The Chair does ask that the board does not come to a final decision until a further time when all are present where the reasons and rationale can be explained.

The Chair recognized Mrs. Linda Burns of 180 Curve Street –Mrs. Burns has lived on Curve Street in 3 different houses for the 65 years. She explained Curve Street is no better than, and no worse than the last 10-15 years. What did help is making it a no entry from Washington Street, although not sure when that happened. It did help the impact. However, that change did make people think that Curve Street is a one-way road. Recently, Curve St. was paved, and the single yellow line was removed from the street. This adds to people thinking Curve is a one way and therefore increased speeding because drivers don't think another car will be coming from the other way. Mrs. Burns is opposed to the temporary speed cushions and plastic delineators. Her and the signors much prefer the options outlined in the letter they sent on 11/25/2022. They feel more extreme measures will cause a lot of safety issues and environmental hazards.

Mr. Burns asked if the speed cushions were removed in the winter for the snowplows. Mr. Mammone answered the permanent speed cushions would be made from asphalt and not be removed for the winter. They would be permanent, and the plows would maneuver with them. Mrs. Burns expressed a strong dislike for the appearance of the delineators and asked if would need to be permanent. Mr. Mammone explained they are needed to aid in the No Parking Restrictions. They were needed for Emergency Response. If these measures become permanent a capital expenditure request will be put for granite curbing that will replace the delineators and the curbing will help mitigate people from mounting the sidewalk to park.

The temporary speed cushions manufacturing was subpar to what the town thought it would be. They were not holding up to the plows and weather. Which is why they are now being made by asphalt.

Mr. Burns expressed his concerns that he doesn't seem to see traffic cushions in other areas of this town or even other towns.

The Chair recognized Jean Donahue Noe.

Jean Donahue Noe: Feels that the parking laws are not enforced and that with the new berms people are forced to walk in the street and this is more even more dangerous.

Chair Bethoney explained because of the agenda we had to stick to the matter at hand. Mrs. Noe also expressed her concern that she does not believe traffic cushions are seen in other areas of town.

Mr. Paul Noe: Mr. Noe felt that more stop signs, signage, and painted street lines would be a better plan than street cushions.

Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone had asked if anyone had spoken with the Mahoney Family at all. No one had spoken with the Mahoney Family.

Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone else would like to be heard. No one else volunteered to speak.

Mr. Packer had a question for Mr. Mammone. Are Stop signs considered traffic calming measures? According to Mr. Mammone stop signs are not considered a traffic calming measure they are regulatory instruments used to regulate and negotiate intersections.

Mr. Packer: Do you recollect the threshold of signatures that are needed to review or petition for speed humps of a roadway? Mr. Mammone answered he believes in the latest Traffic Calming Measures it was determined that it was 40% signatures of property owners on the road to sign off.

Mr. Packer: Regarding public comment on the ballot how is it received from the engineering department? Mr. Mammone explained public comment is sometimes used for people to put frustrations in writing, some use the comment section to applaud our efforts, and we receive some constructive feedback. Recently, it was suggested that more outreaches be done when it came to these types of projects. So right now, we are doing a special flyer and a website to add additional notice. So, we do learn and implement some things from the comments.

Mr. Packer: Would there be engineering plans for the public for this project before anything was implemented. Mr. Mammone this is a tough question to answer. It would really depend on the project.

Mr. Packer: Asked audience member Mrs. Noe if prior to writing the letter if they knew there was a whole process to have these measures for this ballot. Mrs. Noe responded that it was only by chance she found out. She had gone to the Town Managers office to see when the lines were going to be painted and had been inquiring for 3 years even before covid. Mrs. Noe explained that no one had gotten a ballot, or they would have been a lot more vocal a lot sooner. Mr. Packer explained a ballot has not been sent out yet. But it will be sent out and when the ballot is sent out that 75% of the people need to be in favor of it for the project to pass.

Mrs. Burns was under the impression that ballots had been sent out regarding this project.

Mr. Bethoney explained no ballots had been sent out regarding the project with applicant Mr. Connally or the project with applicant Mr. Mahoney. Only ballots sent out have been on projects for Lower East and Upland Road area.

Mr. Bethoney took this time to remind everyone that if a traffic study/evaluation yields a certain score the Traffic Advisory Committee is obligated to make recommendations to mitigation. The minimum score is 50. The score for applicant Mahoney project was well over 50 and considered speed, crash, walkability, and volume. Speed being a main factor.

Mr. Bethoney: Members, what is in front of us this evening is a request for alternative measures? How does the committee members feel about that? Mr. Bethoney further explained that the neighbors present this evening are not interested in the temporary measures going on the ground. They would like alternative measures other than speed humps as the initial mitigation measure.

Mrs. Sullivan: It is evident that there is a problem there, but I would like to hear if there are more ideas. In the letter it states install more speed signs. I travel through many towns for work have noticed more flashing speed limits on side streets not just main streets and I have also noticed on stop signs a more of a raised table with a rumble strip that you notice you are on a different type of surface. I am not sure the pros and cons of them or if they have been investigated in your field what you (Jason Mammone) may suggest.

Mr. Mammone: Some of which you identify are traffic calming measures. The speed feedback signs. The rumble strip is not used as traffic calming measure.

Mr. Kelliher: Does linework need to go through TAC or is it DPW?

Mr. Mammone: Linework is a form of traffic calming but it must be used in the right context. We need evaluate roadway width and the striping that needs to be done. We must follow the manual on uniform traffic control devices to be sure we are doing the proper striping. So, it would fall under the TAC purview if we thought it to be traffic calming.

Mr. Mammone spoke a bit about what allowed a street to be lined based on the manual. Double yellow line would need a roadway for cars of 4000 or more which Curve Street does not meet and the single yellow lines are not recognized. They are considered ambiguous. Both MDC and I never recommend them. However, where we do have some confusion with two-way traffic, we may have some potential to use engineering judgement if we do some measurements and additional studies.

Mr. Bethoney. Mr. Mammone you have looked at the seven recommendations and we have talked about most of them. Another recommendation of No Parking signs where appropriate how would that work?

Mr. Mammone: No parking signs are a regulatory restriction and outside of the purview of TAC. Sometimes we have included them because they become part of a traffic

calming measure. No parking would need to go to the Selectboard and then to the Engineering Department for a study. An advanced warning of a Curve Ahead sign could go up as a traffic calming measure regardless of which way this project goes.

Mr. Bethoney: In most traffic calming we requests we hear this a lot can't we get more police doing enforcement? I know Chief D'Entremount you have your thoughts on this, and I don't know if you want to just say a few things.

Chief D'Entremount: We do have Officers on Curve Street doing speed traps and enforcement. But we also have other roads in town that they need to be on. Our officers move around town quite a bit and go to heavy traffic roads and high accident streets.

Mr. Bethoney: Would Berm or Curbing be a way to offset speed humps?

Mr. Mammone: Sidewalks are traffic calming measures that have been used in the past. Vertical structures that can be used to narrow the roadway to consistent width and provides safety to pedestrians and slow down drivers. It was brought up in our original conversation, but the applicant was only concerned about the speeding, so we were only dealing with speeding.

Mr. Bethoney: Members what we need to think about what we have discussed tonight, we need to invite Mr. Mahoney back to our next meeting, and then make some decisions on a path going forward. As I said earlier, the score is the score which means we are obligated to do something. As I said earlier it does not mean we have to choose the most extreme measure we discussed this evening. I would like to make it clear that if the speed humps are the chosen measure that 75% of the street would need to agree that this was the appropriate traffic calming resolution. But this group here tonight really is not interested in this trial period happening at all.

Ms. Burns: I would like to thank you for having us tonight and for listening to our alternative measures. I really hope that you try these measures before you go to the drastic measures of the original proposal in front of you.

Mr. Bethoney: Discussion on vote of proposed 2023 meeting dates? Motion made by Mr. Packer and seconded by Mrs. Sullivan to approve the 2023 meeting dates. On a roll call vote.

Jack Kelliher - Yes
Charlie Packer - Yes
Dimitria Sullivan - Yes
John Bethoney – Yes

The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Mr. Bethoney: Next we would like to take a vote on the minutes of our meeting held on September 13, 2022. Has everyone had the opportunity to carefully review the minutes

and have any questions or changes they would like to make to the minutes of September 13, 2022.

Mr. Packer made a motion to accept the minutes as presented and seconded my Mrs. Sullivan to approve the September 13, 2022 meeting minutes. A roll call vote was taken.

Charlie Packer – Yes
Dimitria Sullivan - Yes
Jack Kelliher - Yes
John Bethoney – Yes

The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Old/New Business – There was no old or new business.

The next meeting date will be held Tuesday, January 10, 2023, at 7:00 pm.

Adjournment

Being no further business Dimitria Sullivan made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:13pm, and the motion was seconded Jack Kelliher. A roll call vote was taken.

Jack Kelliher - Yes
Dimitria Sullivan - Yes
Charlie Packer - Yes
John Bethoney – Yes

The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.