

TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING

September 16, 2020

IN ATTENCOMMISSIONERCE: Chair Elena Proakis Ellis, Councilor Jack Eccles, Commissioner Rossi, Commissioner Peart, Commissioner Parenti, Chief Mike Lyle, Sgt. Jon Goc and Diane Ardizzoni – Clerk

I. Continued Business:

Approve minutes from June 17, 2020 meeting

Motion to approve minutes by Chief Lyle and seconded by Commissioner Rossi. Elena called the role, all in favor. Minutes approved.

II. New Business:

Resident request to add two new crosswalks across Grove Street – one at Dell Avenue and one at Linwood Avenue

Elena wanted to note that the original wording of the request stated Lynde Avenue instead of Linwood, as Lynde and Grove do not cross and she was fairly certain that Linwood was the road being referenced.

Resident Chris Theile of Grove Street is being brought in as the resident who requested this item.

Chris does confirm that he meant to submit Linwood not Lynde Street. He feels the section of Grove Street between Lebanon and Main Streets is a highly used pedestrian route and he constantly sees people walking and also notes that it is on the 131 bus route with 2 stops, one at Linwood and one closer to Main Street. He and his wife would like to see a crosswalk installed at some point along Grove Street.

Motion to open public comment by Commissioner Rossi and seconded by Commissioner Peart, Elena called the role, all in favor.

Elena read comments that were submitted from Ryan Williams from the Ped-Bike Committee who also lives in the neighborhood, as well as Jonah Chiarenza who is the Chair of the Ped-Bike Committee and wanted to add his name to the letter as well.

Ryan is in support but unable to attend tonight's meeting. He states that he uses Grove Street often and it deserves to be brought in line with the neighborhood character of Melrose. He has had personal conversations with residents from Grove Street that this sentiment is shared by many. He encourages the DPW to allocate some of our City's dedicated funding sources such as ride share program funds to make improvements like speed feedback signs, crossing bump outs that will lead to safer driving behavior and activate Grove as the safe neighborhood street it should be. He states that the City has the capability and funds to implement these improvements to calm traffic, to provide safe crossings through one or multiple years of regular ride share funds which had provided just over \$50k in funding to Melrose since 2017.

Motion to close public comment made by Commissioner Rossi and seconded by Commission Krechmer. Elena called the role, all in favor.

Elena has provided a map in the packet. Commissioner Eccles mentions that Councilor Thomas sent out a letter and would like it included in the minutes. Elena reads Councilor Thomas' letter and he is in support of crosswalks at these

cross streets. He understands the difficulty of crossing Grove Street and notes that it is a much used street all hours of the day. He feels there is a distinct disparity in the number of crosswalks between upper Grove and lower Grove Street.

Commissioner Peart mentions that the comments in a letter read prior that mentions bump outs, wants to clarify that tonight, the commission is considering simply crosswalk locations and Elena did confirm this is exactly what is on the agenda. The bump outs would be a design decision made after the commission votes on the locations. Commissioner Peart would like to state that she thinks it is a great idea as there are no crosswalks along this stretch of Grove Street and that the sight distances are very good along this stretch.

Commissioner Rossi also states that he walks a lot around the City and admits that this is not a location that he walks often but agrees that there are no sight distance issues here.

Commissioner Krechmer makes a motion to approve two crosswalks as specified across Grove Street in the vicinity of Dell Avenue and Linwood Avenue with specific locations to be selected by the DPW. Motion seconded Commissioner Peart. Elena called the role, all in favor. Motion passes.

City request to add crosswalks across Pleasant Street between West Wyoming and Stone Place in one to two locations where they can safely be added

Elena states that this came up in conjunction with the Community Mitigation Fund, which is the money from the casino, for mitigation surrounding anything that has to do with the City of Melrose and potential impacts from the casino. So in our analysis of potential traffic impacts, and pedestrian/bike impacts, we thought that Oak Grove was our most significant tie to the casino since the shuttles run from the Orange line and other stops, specifically Malden Center and perhaps Wellington as well. So the City did a corridor study and Stantec consultants looked at the entire corridor of Washington Street, Pleasant Street and Wyoming from Cottage to Main Street and they made a series of recommendations. We are now ready to move forward to applying back to Gaming Commission with the recommendations that we and the public, through a public meeting, have selected as the most desired improvements. At the public meeting in August, we gave the public until September 15, 2020 to submit any additional comments; Elena did get a few comments on various items that people thought were either a higher or lower priority than how we had them ranked and we will incorporate that feedback. Elena didn't see anything unreasonable. What seemed to be a no brainer was that we need to address the lack of crosswalks on Pleasant Street. We have a bus route and no crosswalks for a very, very long span between Wyoming and Stone Place, which Elena believes is upwards of a mile with no crosswalks. She did include in the packet a map for the Commissioners to take a look at that shows the site distances.

Elena asked if there is anyone virtually that wishes to speak to raise their virtual hand and since no one has, we will continue with our discussion and if anyone does raise their hand we can open it to public comment if need be.

Commissioner Rossi mentions that he does walk this road quite a bit and often does have to cross the street. The place he is most likely to cross is actually fairly far north of the section on Everett Street because that is where he comes out as the site distance is good for him as a pedestrian. At the southern end, he would say probably near Converse Lane which intersects with Pleasant twice, and he feels it wouldn't matter which intersection is selected. Looking at the diagram in the packet it is obvious that there is plenty of site distance south of Gould Street so anywhere in that section, Converse is probably about ½ way out of there but he feels that Everett Street also provides plenty of site distance for both pedestrians and for the drivers.

Commissioner Parenti agrees with Commissioner Rossi's suggestion of Everett Street. He thinks that location makes a lot of sense. There are two bus stops there, one on each side. It is also an excellent walking path from the commuter rail station and to Russell Park. He notes that you can get to Russell Park using the crosswalk at the end of Pleasant Street and W. Wyoming but the Lincoln School property blocks your access a little bit so Everett is a good choice to get towards the south and the west and as Commissioner Rossi mentioned, the site lines are excellent. He thinks we should add two and look at the other choices. He feels Frances is a nominee because of the two bus stops and the other ones are Gould and Converse Lane. He thinks that Frances is too close to Everett and the problem with Gould is the intersection is quite large and for some reason the curve bends away on the west side so the crossings would end up being a little long; it's

better at Converse Lane, which he feels would be a more comfortable crossing and the road straightens out there. There is only the one bus stop, and his preference would be for the northern end of Converse Lane.

Elena has asked the Police if they have any thoughts on any of these particular locations in terms of places that they note to be more dangerous or less dangerous.

Chief Lyle mentions at Frances seems to be a fairly dangerous roadway and anywhere south of Gould or Everett Street is fine.

Sargent Goc is in agreement with everyone that Everett and Converse seem like the best and that would be his suggestion also.

Elena mentions that is her preference as well when she went out there.

Commissioner Rossi agrees with everything that's been said and also agrees with Commissioner Parenti about not putting one at Gould as it is a wide intersection but actually doesn't get you anywhere and agrees with both locations.

Commissioner Rossi makes motion to put in crosswalks across Pleasant Street at Everett Street and the northern intersection with Converse Lane, seconded by Councilor Eccels. Elena called the role, all in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

Resident request to institute trucking ban on Lynde Ave. from West Wyoming Avenue to Washington Street, on Glen Street from the Fellsway to Lynde Ave., and on Trenton Street from West Wyoming to Washington Street

Councilor Stewart was the one who sent this agenda item in and is brought in as a panelist.

Councilor Stewart states that this actually started when he was out campaigning while going door to door and received the feedback in these particular neighborhoods that the number one complaint was the traffic and a common complaint of large vehicles that were driving through these neighborhoods on a consistent basis that raised a number of concerns within the constituency. Specifically, safety was one of the big issues. These neighborhoods are full of young families and children everywhere and with COVID there are fewer children walking to school, but under normal circumstances those are main thoroughfares for kids going to and from school. He notes that people generally speed on these streets and trucks are one of the big offenders. Additionally, from a safety perspective, both Glen and Lynde have hills that are fairly significant and cut down the sight lines which add to the concerns about safety. Second, the condition of the roads are attributed to a lot of these heavier vehicles that are going through here on a consistent basis. He feels because of the size of the streets, they are not designed to have large trucks coming through. He provided a petition as part of this request which was signed by members of the neighborhood and there is a lot of strong support for eliminating trucking if at all possible. The noise and disturbance that is caused by trucks in particular is an impact to the neighborhood. He states that the houses can shake when these trucks drive by. He acknowledges the concern in policing this and is willing to work with Sargent Goc on understanding smart strategies for efficient policing of these neighborhoods. He states that it is the same offenders and thinks it is prudent to identify the times and the specific trucks, pick out a day to stop them and ask them to comply with the law. He would like to begin the discussion, collect data and to understand how we can reduce this type of truck traffic in these neighborhoods.

Elena asks if there is one direction trucks are traveling through these neighborhoods more often than the other? Also, do we have any sense where these trucks are ultimately going?

Councilor Stewart believes that from W. Wyoming to Washington Street in the morning and the reverse direction toward the evening is what they normally see. Secondly, there are local businesses that are most likely the destinations for these vehicles. He cannot say for sure, but that is his feeling.

Elena mentions that trucks are not allowed on the Fellsway so asks if they are typically going Wyoming to Washington Street or coming from Washington Street from the south from the Malden direction and heading toward Wyoming.

Commissioner Peart mentions the term “truck” is a very broad term and was wondering if we could narrow in on this as certainly a “truck” could be considered a landscaping vehicle with a trailer behind it that makes a lot of noise as it goes by so she would like to discuss the types of vehicles that are being defined as trucks.

Councilor Stewart states “trucks that are not van sized, Amazon type and trucks that are larger than a Ford F-250 he thinks are the ones that are more offensive. He states he has seen a 750 barreling down Trenton Street at 35 mph.

Councilor Eccles is concerned if we blocked the outlet from Lynde, Trenton and Glen would it make it so that every truck that wanted to take that route would use Clinton and Cottage and maybe that is a better question for some of the other commissioners.

Councilor Stewart states this is not typically used as a cut through because when you get to the end of Cottage Street there is a bit of a jarred right and jarred left and is not a straight through and when using Cottage Street approaching Russell it is a very steep hill so not used by trucks often.

Motion to open public comment made by Commissioner Rossi and seconded by Commissioner Peart. Elena calls role, all in favor.

Adam LaFrance is being brought in as a panelist and is a resident of Trenton Street. He wants to speak in favor of this proposal. He is at the intersection of Russell Street and concurs that the heavy trucking does go up and down Trenton Street and is a popular pass through in a neighborhood that is entirely residential and populated with young children. He does echo the morning and evening tend to be the time he sees this activity.

Finn McSweeney is brought in as a panelist and states that he is not necessarily going to speak in favor of or against this particular proposal, he did want to thank Councilor Stewart for raising it. The real concern here is traffic calming and safety. The more we hear from residents that we want more traffic calming in the City, the more we hear from Councilors that think this is a great thing. He wants to caution against a patch work approach to this problem. The issue of oversized pickup trucks is one that plagues the entire City. When we talk about density of residences, he wants to make sure that we are not taking a patch work approach and we are doing this equitably and if we are talking about instituting traffic calming benefits which are meant to help the most people we are only doing those things where the most people live as opposed to doing them by percentage. For example, not 100% of the usage on W. Wyoming is residential, but you will still find more residential units on Wyoming in a much greater density. The real issue is traffic calming and when these vehicles are in our neighborhoods they are not able to speed.

Motion to close public comment made by Commissioner Rossi and seconded by Commissioner Peart. Elena called role, all in favor.

Elena wants to call attention to the information included in the packet. This is information that she pulled together at the request for a truck ban on Upham Street so she used the same quotes from that time. These are the Mass DOT truck ban requirements and they have specific warrants for instituting a truck ban. She reads this for those who don't have this information. She is using this information for both this item and the next item on the agenda.

Commissioner Rossi asks that the State regulation that you cited specifically mentions “heavy commercial vehicles” and so first of all it does not state what heavy is so he is guessing a large pickup truck was not heavy enough and also says commercial vehicle so if it is a privately owned one, that would not be commercial. He did google quickly under Mass.gov commercial truck regulations but it mentions that you need a permit if the weight on any axial exceeds 18,000 pounds and if it is greater than 8.5 feet high. He is not sure whether or not the trucks that are in this neighborhood that people are seeing would fall into that category and therefore even if we put a truck ban in whether that would actually eliminate the trucks that are causing the issues for the residents.

Elena states that this is an excellent point.

Commissioner Peart has a question for Sargent Goc. She is wondering if we have historical traffic counts along any of these streets and if they have any classifications so that we can truly understand the volume of trucks relative to the volume of traffic. Sargent Goc does not have data and his comments would be because we don't have data, and he hopes that we would have some type of data to make a decision that shows over the last month, this many trucks went down these roads. He does not have the capability to produce this data.

Chief Lyle asks the depth of road construction on Lynde Avenue, is that the same as Wyoming Avenue? Elena believes yes, with the only exception that she knows of being Main Street, which has a very thick concrete decking. He also wants to ask as far of these vehicles we are talking about CDL rated vehicles as far as heavy trucking and he is a CDL holder. To have people trying to restrict pick-up trucks, the police department could not handle the phone calls. There are pick-up trucks on every street in the City and these are his concerns. Do we go out and put a surveillance camera to obtain the names of the trucking companies, see where they are going and he believes that Lynde is the last right before you go out to the Parkway and that is why a lot of vehicles are taking that right. If it is trucks that are coming off of Route 93 and sneaking by the Stone Zoo and coming down, they are most likely making deliveries and that is a direct shot too.

Councilor Stewart believes that it is not privately owned trucks that are the main concern it is more the commercial vehicles that are much larger, much heavier, much louder that are typically making deliveries or contracted to work in certain areas and are using these avenues to short cut the route they would typically go otherwise.

Commissioner Parenti does disclose that he is a resident of Trenton Street himself so would benefit personally from this particular item, but that aside, he has not in his career, met a single resident anywhere of any place that has been opposed to a ban of trucks on their street. In particular, because you can still receive all of your deliveries, Amazon, UPS or building materials the trucks are allowed to make deliveries on your street, so as a resident there really is no reason not to be opposed to all of the trucks driving down your street making noise. So as a Commissioner it is hard to oppose an action like this. He does want to ask a process question, as it is his understanding that the City needs to apply to the State for a permit and we need to show that the items you read from the Mass Amendments of MUTCD; the city needs to show that they meet those warrants and we essentially need to convince MassDOT that we meet those so they can issue a permit, and at that point we would be able to post no truck signs. It is Elena's understanding as well, and when we had this same discussion with regard to Upham Street, we had traffic counts already but what we would do as a commission we would vote to yes or no on going further in the process. She would think that with no vote of this commission it would very difficult for someone to go to MassDOT to request the truck ban on any street. With a vote of this commission to take the next step, the next step would be the data gathering phase and at that point we would establish whether we would have to take another vote at a future meeting to establish if we wanted to recommend putting together the documentation to submit to MassDOT. At that point, if we took that route for any truck ban, we would send along with our letter to MassDOT indication that the Traffic Commission has voted favorably and to recommend this item. We are a couple steps away from that point in the process now and the most we could potentially vote tonight would be to go further in the process to gather the data. There is obviously a cost for that, Elena cautions the commission. She personally states that when we take a vote, she is fine with gathering data in this neighborhood, some funding is available to do so at this time, but would caution that we can't gather this data on every street in Melrose. We have to be sure that we are voting to move forward based on a perception that there might be a reason to move forward that maybe the restriction on the Fellsway means that the trucks turn down Lynde as they approach the Fellsway or certain hours of the day everyone cuts down Trenton because they are trying to avoid the intersection at Pleasant. Whatever the case may be, she wants to make sure that we think intelligently about what we would carry to that next level. Commissioner Parenti wants to add that to predict the next stages in the process if we say yes tonight and go to the State, the three warrants that you mention and as Sargent Goc pointed out, we are probably not going to make 5% trucks on any of these streets and the window is 5-8%; it is a difficult target to hit. The second warrant is pavement condition, we may make that one, and the third one is residential land use, we have that and we can think about a night ban which is what that warrant allows although this does not help us during the day. So there are a couple of directions this could go. The weight of the vehicles needs to be defined, as Commission Peart pointed out what is a truck? What is heavy is defined in Chapter 90 which is somewhat convoluted and it has been Commissioner Parenti's experience in each community, when it comes to enforcement, has a different interpretation of what heavy is, not necessarily the actual weight of the vehicle, it is what the vehicle is rated to carry. That is not something that an enforcement officer can necessarily judge. So whether a vehicle is or is not a truck becomes an open question. What a

citizen thinks is a truck and what is enforceable may be two different things. So fast forwarding to a day that may have a "No Truck" sign on any of these streets then it becomes how are we going to enforce it and what the community expects from the Police Department and what they can do in terms of keeping trucks, whatever we think those are, off the streets once we have the ban. There is not exactly a clear path between where we are today and what we want; tonight is one step and we have to do a lot of work to get where we want to go between the Commission, the City, and the State. There is a lot of conversation that still need to happen and tonight is just the first step.

Councilor Eccles has a procedural question. If tonight we voted to pass the truck ban on these 3 streets and then when we go forward with the application to the State says we don't meet any of the warrants except C which is the nighttime ban, could it be walked back or would it be flat out rejected and come back to the commission and we would have to vote on a nighttime ban?

Elena states if we gather the data and then bring it back to the commission and we then decided that we were prepared to take another vote as to whether to take it to MassDOT, we could specify in our motion whether we would proceed with a nighttime ban if MassDOT only approved the night ban or only putting it forth as a daytime ban and if it gets rejected it could come back to the commission, we could be specific enough in our motion to decide at that time which way we want to go.

Commissioner Krechmer asks if we were to go out and try to collect the data, he assumes we would be looking at truck percentages, how would we do it? And would you sample certain times of the day or a period of time? It seems to get a full picture would be a pretty good effort beyond what was reasonable but probably ways to get it through some sort of sampling, do you have anything in mind?

Elena states that when we looked at this at Upham Street the resident hired a company to come out and take traffic counts, but they were able to do it with standard counting equipment. She recalls that they used pole mounted and the data that we got from those counts was classifying vehicles in a number of different categories by size. She has also seen that with the tubes, where they can classify by weight.

Sargent Goc is not aware if the Police Department's tubes can collect that data. He was told when they got it fairly recently that it does not do trucks but he will check and he states that from studies he has done he has not been able to separate it that way.

Elena recalls that with the traffic counts we are typically looking at \$1,000-\$2,000 to have a weeks' worth data - enough to have a representative sample. So if we were to do it in three different locations we are looking about approximately \$5000 in that range.

Commissioner Rossi questions, do we have to take a vote to collect data? If we are taking a vote is going to be something specific but if we want to collect data on a broader sense or decide later, does the commission have to take action in order for the City to collect the data.

Elena states that this is a decision whether or not to move forward down a regulatory path, so we are basically saying do we want to pursue the next step in a truck ban. Commissioner asks when is the next step done, and is it to apply to the State or collect the data so we know whether to apply to the State? Elena states that it would be to collect the data and then we would come back and take a vote whether to apply to the State. We definitely would need a vote on whether to apply to the State; Elena doesn't think this is something that could come without a Traffic Commission recommendation. We can certainly gather data without a vote of this commission; she is a little torn whether we want to make it that easy for someone to request that we collect traffic data. It is important, specifically for a truck ban, for the commission to have to weigh in because we can now get 20 more requests from residents saying that if the commission doesn't need to vote on taking traffic counts for truck ban, the City can take traffic counts at these 20 other locations and we are now at a cost of \$20,000 with no funding source. Her only hesitation is that we want to have some process for something that is this significant but she does not have a strong preference what that process is, if it's just that we require them to come to this board to initiate the process then we decide to go through the traffic counts more informally, that can also work.

Commissioner Rossi would be okay with the commission taking a vote and if it is more symbolic that we think it is a good idea to collect the data. We may want to somehow define the parameters of the data and that leads to the comments he would like to make. First, the residents would be correct if there are cut throughs but some of these cut throughs cannot ever be avoided, specifically people coming north on the Fellsway from Malden, they have to turn on Glen to get onto Washington St.; there is no other way to get there unless they go all the way to Wyoming which is way out of the way and nobody is going to do it. We cannot eliminate all the cut through traffic just because there is no other way to get off the Fellsway. Another important point is that trucks cannot be going through Melrose in that direction, because there are no routes that trucks are allowed. They cannot go on Fellsway, Ravine Road and Pond Street as they all have truck prohibitions. So any of the trucks are either already breaking the law or they are actually bound for a place in Melrose, perhaps along W. Wyoming. Washington Street itself from Pleasant to the Fellsway is completely residential so they are not generating any trucks other than residential deliveries, so the trucks that are coming are coming from south of Pleasant Street and they must be bound for the area of W. Wyoming otherwise it wouldn't make any sense to take that route. What we need to do is think about if we prohibit trucks from Glen and Lynde, where are those trucks going to go? They would go to Trenton, if we prohibit Trenton as well, then they would go to Clinton and if we prohibited Clinton they would go onto Crescent Avenue. So, if we want to prohibit all of this, the comments that Mr. McSweeney made are important, because the only way they can go then is up Pleasant to Wyoming and take a left which means they are going past the train station, going into an area that is congested under normal traffic conditions during peak periods, there is a train crossing just east that also increases the congestion and of course would go in front of the school. If we were to implement some kind of ban, if we didn't want to just move it from some residential streets to others, we would have to move it onto Pleasant Street and onto Wyoming and we need to think if that is something we want to do. So he feels that collecting the data is a good idea as we would get an idea of how many of these trucks it is and what kind of effect we would be having on Pleasant and W. Wyoming. He is not in favor of limiting this to some of the residential streets. Basically everything between Washington, Wyoming and Pleasant we would need to treat as a whole.

Commission Parenti mentions that there is one more approach before we expend traffic money that is to have a conversation with the State traffic engineering about what our options are. For example, if we are right and we can't make the 5-8%, then can we approach on the warrant of condition of pavement? Can we apply to the State with just that alone, or does he require us to take the data anyway. MassDOT tends to like data but if we can save ourselves some money and if he says sure send us the application then we would have to expend the money. Maybe a motion tonight is to continue with this petition by interacting with Mass DOT to see what they want to see the City use for them as part of our application.

Elena does mention that on roadway condition and trying to move forward with just that as meeting a warrant, the DPW does have a roadway condition assessment city wide which was just done this past spring and Glenn, Lynde and Trenton all came up in the fair category. Unless we look to see if one of these roads were just above the poor category, maybe we could make the argument that the poor category constitutes severe deterioration and because they are presently in the fair category and any truck traffic is going to bring them down into the next category that is one thing we could look at is how close to the threshold are they, but right now they are not in those worse categories.

Commissioner Rossi asks about the developments that went on at lower Washington Street from Pleasant down to Oak Grove; there must have been some traffic data collected there and it is going to be a few years old and is not exactly in the area we are discussing, but if any trucks were going up to the neighborhood of Glenn Street and Lynde Avenue they must have been coming up Washington Street, so we might have some information on truck volume.

Commission Peart is very familiar with the traffic study done for 99 Washington Street which was done by the company she works for and the report is public information. She has the data at her fingertips. They did do turning movement counts at Pleasant and Washington and several other intersections, what she does not recall offhand is whether we had truck data. Commissioner would add to the conversation that this issue of pass by traffic on these exact streets that are the topic of conversation came up in regard to the 99 Washington Street Development. There was concern that the redevelopment of that was going to cause additional traffic to come through the neighborhood which ultimately we concluded that no, that was not going to be an impact.

Commissioner Peart has located the study and the traffic counts that overlap with some of the discussion tonight on Washington at Pleasant St, which discusses turning movement counts along with what the truck or heavy vehicle percentage is on each of those roads. In the morning if you were coming southbound, eastbound on Washington Street towards Oak Grove during the peak hour there were 0 percent of 384 vehicles on that maneuver. Coming northbound on Washington Street it looks like in the evening the truck percentage is .5 percent of 574 so that would be the volume that would ultimately continue up Washington and potentially turn onto one of the intersecting streets.

Councilor Eccles makes a motion to initiate a conversation with MassDOT and if they think it makes sense, to move forward with the traffic counts on Lynde and Trenton.

Elena calls the role, motion carries 6 to 1 with Commissioner Peart being the no vote.

Resident request to restrict truck traffic on Rowe Street between Porter Street and Green Street and City request to clarify truck restrictions on Porter Street

Elena has provided some citations from the traffic code. Presently there is a restriction of heavy commercial vehicles. The use or operation of heavy commercial vehicles is hereby restricted on the following streets or parts of streets in the manner outlined herein as during the time set forth. One of those listed is Porter Street from Main Street to the Melrose/Saugus line during the hours of 5:00 am and 8:00 pm and Green Street from Main Street northerly to Howard Street from midnight to 8:30 am. Both of those code provisions are highly relevant to this discussion as they impact the movement of trucks in and around this area of Melrose Wakefield Hospital and to some degree in ways that are somewhat contradictory to Hospital operations.

Joanna Manwell, Mark Garipay and Ryan Fay from Melrose Wakefield Hospital are brought in as panelists.

Ms. Manwell has lived on Rowe Street for approximately 25 years and states that there was an informal agreement with the Hospital going back that when the trucks left the Hospital they would actually turn right and go on Rowe Street behind hospital. She believes that there was sign at the end of her road that stated something along the lines that it was prohibited for trucks only for delivery or something to that effect. With trucks using her particular section of Rowe Street she states that the condition of the road is poor, there are a lot of young families, there is a disabled resident, and the turn at the end onto Green Street is quite impossible for large trucks. She would like to see us work informally with the Hospital as we did in the past, to inform their truck drivers to take the right onto Rowe Street. She also states that there was a time in which they could make deliveries and time when they were not allowed to. She would like to see a sign at the end of her street which actually prohibits the truck coming along her section of Rowe Street. She does make reference to the 7:00 am noise ordinance and if that could a factor whether the trucks should be coming down the street at that time. The neighborhood is very open to working with the Hospital.

Councilor Garipay would like to reiterate the route of going down Rowe Street to Green Street is clearly no possible way that someone could take a left and the only other way would be towards the Parkway and a tractor trailer cannot navigate without going up on the curb.

Ryan Fay from Melrose Wakefield Hospital speaks to the group and states that he has had some discussion with the folks at the Hospital loading docks. They state that their hours of operation begin at 7:00 am and are mostly clearing out by 4:00 pm. He does acknowledge that the Laundry service may come after those hours based on shifts at the Hospital. He cannot control FedEx and UPS from coming as they can come after hours. He is willing to talk with Sysco truck and find out what route they are taking and could work with the neighbors. He is willing to work with the neighborhood and provides his office phone number 781-979-3268 for any operations concerns or any issues. He indicates to contact him directly.

Motion to open public comment by Chief Lyle and seconded by Commissioner Peart. Elena called the role, all in favor.

Elena has brought in residents who are in favor of this, John Zhao and Katherine DiRicco.

Motion to close public comment made by Commission Parenti and seconded by Commissioner Rossi. Elena call the role, all in favor.

Elena states that based on everything we are hearing, unfortunately, the traffic code is not consistent with the present operations. The fact that deliveries are happening from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm and the traffic code states that trucks cannot be on Porter Street from Main Street all the way to the end from 5:00 am to 8:00 pm is not feasible as the loading dock to the hospital is on Porter Street. We need to modify the traffic code and Elena mentions she does not know whether to change or lift a truck ban. One idea she did have that was reflected in the discussion in the packet is that we could possibly put up a sign at Porter and Rowe saying "Trucks No Left Turn" 12:00 am to 8:30 am because the only place to go when making that left turn is to Green Street and Green Street has a truck restriction. Sometimes just having those signs there deters 90% of the traffic because they don't look at the hours they just see the sign and assume that they can't go that way. This may impact the neighbors on the call who are concerned. It would not be a strict truck restriction for the rest of the day but it would be something and it would allow the Hospital to work with the trucks for the other hours. Anything more than just putting up a sign to enforce that they can't go down towards Green Street, Elena believes that it takes trucks who perhaps may be going in all different directions now and makes them all have to go the same way which then provides a more substantial impact to just one residential area rather than dividing it up. Elena asks if any one of the Traffic experts on the Commission know anything about how we would change a truck restriction on Porter Street rather than eliminating it or the like; she would like to hear if anyone knows that process as she does not.

Commission Parenti mentions that if the regulation on file has a permit behind it, but if you have the file that would be helpful and he presumes we would have to go back to the State (MassDOT) to amend it or cancel it. If there is not one on file that may become an issue. If a permit is not on file, we may not have a regulation, although the State may have it on file. He does not believe that we can do a No Left Turn for certain vehicles but the Commission can restrict Left turns to all vehicles and that may be a trade-off that we are willing to talk about if this is a problem that occurs frequently at certain hours and is mostly trucks which may solve the problem outright and we wouldn't have to worry about going to the State at all.

Elena wants to clarify on the No Left Turns for trucks onto Rowe Street for the those certain hours, she was thinking it could be an advisory sign because it is advising that once you get down to Green Street during those hours you are not allowed to so it is keeping trucks from reaching a place where we already have a restriction in place which would be a Yellow sign.

Commission Parenti sees where she is going with this option but thinks that the way to post it would be tricky. Regulatory signs are white and rectangular and warning signs are yellow and diamond shape, we would have to put some thought into how that would be posted and on a reasonably sized sign to explain that trucks are banned from Green Street. He would guess that the truck operators understand that Green Street is restricted and know the rule and are going around it on purpose. He believes the fortunate part here is we have a parcel (the Hospital) that is generating most of the truck trips and that is good and Mr. Fay who is representing the Hospital and if we can open a relationship/conversation with the Hospital and the neighborhood, taking care of the problem directly, if often the best way to do it. That conversation does not involve this Commission, City or the State at all and Mr. Fay has offered to work with and has effect on what routes the drivers take that may be the best way to attack this problem directly.

Chief Lyle wants to comment on the Left turn onto Rowe Street. That impacts the Emergency Room, people coming down the Parkway or Howard Street to the Hospital. He believes an advisory sign is fine. One other point is Bellevue Golf Course has a fair amount of trucks making deliveries and he doesn't know if they use Porter Street or East Street but certainly Porter Street being restricted all the way up will impact that.

Elena mentions in the past when we have had to look up specific speed regulations, MassDOT has had them on file so they probably have a better reference than we do, so she can ask that question. We have the option of doing nothing and working with the Hospital, but then the code that is not enforced, not signed and not an actual restriction. It is definitely preferable to not have things in the code that can't be enforced because the loading dock is on Porter Street.

Councilor Eccles does mention that deliveries to the Golf Course are seasonal and slow down after September and asks if the commission can table the item and work with Ryan Fay and the residents to try to come up with a solution. He would like to table this in case some of the residents aren't happy. He is willing to work with the Hospital and residents to come up with a solution.

Jo Manwell thinks this is a good idea and if residents could chat more with the Hospital and try to figure out how to work together and feels that her neighbors would also be in agreement with that.

Chief Lyle makes a motion to table and seconded by Councilor Eccles. In the meantime, Elena will reach out to the State to find out if there is any record of the Porter Street restriction. Commission Krechmer comments that the other questions to ask them is if you are modifying hours or moving the restriction on Porter back a block, do you have to go through the whole process we talked about? Commission Parenti will provide Elena with the State Traffic Engineer's contact information. Elena called the role, all in favor to table this item.

Motion to adjourn made by Chief Lyle, seconded by Commissioner Krechmer. Elena called the role, all in favor.
Meeting adjourned at 7:57 pm.