Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee

October 27, 2025 – Public Safety Building, 2nd Floor & Zoom

MEETING MINUTES

Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee
October 27, 2025 – 3:00 PM
Public Safety Building 2nd Floor, 112 North Street, Medfield
Hybrid Meeting (In-Person and Zoom)

Call to Order

Ms. Guerette, Chief of Police, opened the meeting at 3:00 PM and called the session of the Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee to order. She identified the members present, including herself; Mr. Goulet, Director of Public Works; Mr. Caskey; and Ms. Obbagy. She remarked with humor that she had long mispronounced Ms. Obbagy's last name. She also noted the presence of Ms. Franklin (Assistant Town Administrator), who was attending on behalf of Town Administrator Ms. Trierweiler.

She briefly explained that the committee meets whenever a sufficient number of requests, complaints, or concerns have been submitted by residents and that the committee reviews each matter either with the resident present or, if not present, by reading the request into the record.

Resident Request: David Temple — Left-Turn Signal at Routes 109 & 27

Ms. Guerette introduced the first request: Mr. Temple's inquiry, forwarded via Select Board member Mr. Osler Peterson, proposing that after the left-turn green arrow expires at Routes 109 and 27, the signal change to a flashing yellow—allowing left turns when oncoming traffic is clear.

Mr. Temple identified himself as David Temple of 300 South Street. He stated that the request arose while discussing bicycle visibility initiatives with Mr. Peterson. He explained that in North Carolina and in some other states, left-turn arrows transition to flashing yellow after the

protected phase ends, permitting safe discretionary turns. He asked whether Massachusetts law prohibits such operation.

Mr. Goulet described the difficulty created when large trucks or queued vehicles obstruct the view of oncoming traffic. He noted that wide intersections, like Routes 109 and 27, increase crossing distances, and that drivers sometimes accelerate to beat changing lights—heightening the risk of turning vehicles.

Mr. Temple maintained that the sight distance at the 109/27 intersection was adequate.

Mr. Goulet responded that although the first vehicle in line may have clear visibility, subsequent drivers often do not, particularly when heavy trucks are queued. He emphasized that misjudgment of approaching vehicle speeds is common.

Ms. Guerette clarified that Massachusetts does not prohibit flashing yellow left-turn signals. She asked Mr. Temple whether his primary hope was to reduce traffic delays.

Mr. Temple stated that when a driver sits in the left-turn lane facing a red arrow—even though the through-lane is green and no cars are approaching—the flashing yellow system would allow safe movement rather than forcing drivers to wait through another entire cycle.

Ms. Guerette stated that based on extensive enforcement in the uptown area, left-turn phases are not a significant contributor to traffic backup. Rather, overall volume and train events cause congestion. She expressed concern that permitting discretionary left turns would increase serious crash risk due to oncoming vehicles traveling 25–30 mph through a wide intersection. She noted that current crashes at that location are predominantly rear-end collisions, not severe angle crashes.

Mr. Temple commented that drivers would not turn into the path of an approaching vehicle. Ms. Guerette stated that drivers often misjudge speed and distance, and she reiterated that discretionary left turns could increase the frequency of severe collisions.

Ms. Franklin noted that the Town had received a state earmark to study the Route 109 corridor from Route 27 to South Street, including signal coordination.

The committee and Mr. Temple discussed longstanding timing issues at the left-turn phases, including perceived inconsistencies tied to whether a vehicle arrives early or late in the cycle. Ms. Guerette and Mr. Goulet confirmed that the signals are likely time-based rather than sensor-based.

After extensive discussion, Ms. Guerette stated she would entertain a motion not to recommend any change at this time, pending the forthcoming traffic study.

MOTION: To not recommend changes to the left-turn signal at Routes 109 and 27 pending completion of the Route 109 traffic study.
SECONDED: Mr. Caskey

VOTE: Aye (voice vote; no opposition noted)
MOTION CARRIES

Resident Request: Lois Ashcroft — Prohibition of Engine (“Air”) Brakes on Main Street

Ms. Guerette invited Ms. Ashcroft to speak next, given her attendance in person. Ms. Ashcroft described living for 29 years at Main Street and Nye Road and witnessing substantial growth in truck traffic. She said that trucks descending toward the intersection frequently engage loud engine brakes, shaking her windows and disturbing residents. She asked why Route 27 has a sign prohibiting engine brakes while Route 109 does not.

Mr. Goulet explained that “Jake braking” is a branded term for engine braking, which is designed as a safety feature to slow large trucks—particularly when carrying heavy payloads. He said its use varies depending on payload, driver judgment, and route.

Ms. Ashcroft stated that many restored historic homes along Route 109 face quality-of-life impacts from the noise and questioned whether a 40 mph speed limit is appropriate between Town Street and Brook Street.

Ms. Guerette noted that she was unfamiliar with the origins or enforceability of the Route 27 sign and that engine-braking restrictions are typically governed by local ordinance, not state law. She said she would need to research whether Medfield has such an ordinance and whether the existing sign on Route 27 was installed under a development permit or separate approval.

At this point, Mr. Joe Kelley, resident of 11 Cheney Pond Road, joined via Zoom. He explained that he had contacted Tresca directly about contractor dump trucks using engine brakes on Route 109. He said Tresca had attempted to reduce the behavior but could not control all drivers. He argued that engine braking is not necessary under normal conditions, and that allowing it only in emergencies—as other towns do—would greatly improve quality of life. He urged enforcement and signage along the entire Route 109 corridor.

Ms. Guerette thanked Mr. Kelley for his detailed insight and confirmed that no state law governs engine braking, meaning local ordinance is required. She committed to researching the matter within the week.

Mr. Caskey stated that the volume of complaints suggested the issue deserved action. Ms. Ashcroft described early-morning and afternoon noise patterns and reiterated the disruptive impact. Mr. Goulet asked clarifying questions regarding whether noise correlated with high-traffic or low-traffic periods.

The committee collectively expressed openness to restrictions if legally permissible. Ms. Guerette promised to research applicable bylaws, the history of the Route 27 sign, and potential enforcement mechanisms, and to follow up with residents.

Resident Request: Daniel Adams — Speed Limit Reduction on Route 109 & Radar Signs

Ms. Guerette next recognized Mr. Adams, who requested reducing the Route 109 westbound speed limit from 45 mph to 35 mph and installing solar speed radar signs on secondary streets.

Mr. Adams explained that he had lived at his home for 13 years and described significant traffic growth on Route 109. He referred to a severe crash at 109 and Bridge Street, and described dangerous conditions when attempting to turn left onto Bridge Street: drivers behind him often become impatient, attempt to pass him while he is turning, or approach too quickly. He described narrow nearby streets, lack of sidewalks, landscaping trucks blocking lanes, and frequent speeding.

Ms. Guerette explained MassDOT's requirement for 85th-percentile-based speed studies. She stated that the department conducted its own preliminary data: over 32,451 outbound vehicles showed an average of 37 mph and an 85th percentile of 44 mph; inbound speeds (posted 35 mph) produced an 85th percentile of 42 mph—suggesting that a formal study would likely increase the speed limit to 40 mph.

She clarified that the fatal Bridge Street crash did not involve speed as a contributing factor. She added that passing a left-turning vehicle by crossing the center line is an enforcement issue, not a speed-limit issue.

Mr. Caskey asked about state authority to increase limits; Ms. Guerette and Mr. Goulet confirmed the state's control of numbered routes.

The committee discussed radar signs. Ms. Guerette supported installation of a solar radar sign on Route 109 inbound, noting she lacked FY25 funding but could install one by July of next year. Mr. Adams agreed. Costs of $8,000 per sign were discussed, along with concerns about excessive signage and sign fatigue.

The committee reached consensus to install a solar radar sign on Route 109 inbound in July of the next budget year. (No motion was made; the committee treated this as a consensus directive.)

Resident Request: Melina & Allie — Safety at Green Street & Brook Street

Two young residents, Melina and Allie of Green Street, spoke about dangerous conditions at the Brook/Green intersection. They described frequent near-misses, heavy cut-through traffic, and the many children walking to Hinkley Playground and other destinations. They noted that bushes previously obstructing visibility had been removed but that pedestrian danger remained. They requested installation of a push-button crosswalk beacon like those at the schools and Rail Trail.

Ms. Guerette praised their civic engagement and described prior committee discussions on the same intersection. She and Mr. Goulet recounted how overgrown plantings had previously obstructed sightlines but were removed with the homeowner's cooperation. Still, the area remained heavily used by children and cyclists.

Ms. Guerette stated that while stop signs were not warranted, a driver-alert system was appropriate and that the intersection had come before the committee multiple times. She recommended installing a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) at the crosswalk.

MOTION: To install a rectangular rapid flashing beacon at the intersection of Brook Street and Green Street.
SECONDED: *[Not individually identified; vote proceeded immediately.]*
VOTE: Aye (voice vote; no opposition noted)
MOTION CARRIES

Resident Request: Eric Morse — Stop Sign at Farm Street & North Street

Ms. Guerette introduced Mr. Morse's request to replace the yield sign at Farm Street and North Street with a stop sign. She explained the angled geometry of the intersection and the legal requirements of a yield (stop only if necessary for safe passage).

Mr. Goulet asked about crash history. Ms. Guerette reported one accident in the past year.

Ms. Obbagy commented that drivers often fail to treat yields properly, creating tension at merges. Ms. Guerette stated that from an enforcement perspective, a stop sign would not materially change the hazard, as drivers are already required to stop when conflicting traffic is present. Mr. Goulet added that most similar merge configurations in Medfield use yield signs and that crash history does not suggest a problem.

Mr. Caskey stated that he travels the route frequently and has not observed issues. The committee agreed that current data does not support a change.

Ms. Guerette offered to direct additional enforcement to the area and to review five-year crash history.

The committee took no formal action, agreeing to revisit the matter after enforcement and data review.

Resident Request: Ken Jenkins — Lakewood Drive Signage

Ms. Guerette summarized Mr. Jenkins's request for a sign at Lakewood Drive indicating "Children at Play," "Dead End," or "Slow Down." She noted the concerns about drivers entering the short street from Granite Street at excessive speeds.

Mr. Goulet explained that Lakewood Drive contains about twelve homes and is not a cut-through, though occasional drivers may mistakenly enter. He stated that a "Dead End" sign may be misleading because Lakewood Terrace branches from the road.

Ms. Guerette said she was comfortable installing a cautionary sign, as they are non-regulatory and simple to implement.

Mr. Goulet then made a motion:

MOTION: To install a "No Outlet" sign at the entrance of Lakewood Drive at Granite Street.
SECONDED: *[Second not individually named]*
VOTE: Aye (voice vote; no opposition noted)
MOTION CARRIES

Resident Request: Paul Scace — Crosswalk at Green Street & Kenney Road

Ms. Guerette read Mr. Scace's letter from 94 Green Street describing accessibility challenges at the intersection of Green and Kenney. He explained that the absence of a curb ramp forces families to lift heavy wagons onto the street, creating unsafe conditions. He requested installation of a crosswalk with accessible ramps.

Mr. Goulet described ADA requirements for new crosswalks and the $7,000–$10,000 associated cost. He explained competing townwide priorities, including roughly 400 existing noncompliant curb ramps, and the Complete Streets plan prioritizing routes to schools, playgrounds, and the town center.

Ms. Obbagy noted that although this location is near Hinkley Playground, the Town must maintain consistent prioritization.

Ms. Guerette stated that although the request is reasonable, it appears to be a “want” rather than an urgent safety need.

MOTION: To table the request for a crosswalk at Green Street and Kenney Road for future planning as Complete Streets expands.
SECONDED: Mr. Caskey
VOTE: Aye (voice vote; no opposition noted)
MOTION CARRIES

Resident Request: Erin Tischuk — No-Idling Signs on Hillcrest Road

Ms. Guerette reviewed Ms. Tischuk’s request for no-idling signs to address parent vehicles idling during student pickup. She expressed concern about over-signing a residential area and suggested that police presence and parent education would be more effective.

Mr. Goulet agreed that the same parents return daily, making education impactful.

Ms. Guerette directed her officers to address the matter beginning this week. No additional signage was approved at this time.

Resident Request: Christine McCue — Turn Lane at North Meadows Road (Mother Anna’s Plaza)

Ms. Guerette read Ms. McCue’s request regarding traffic backups at the plaza entrance. Ms. McCue suggested shortening the northbound left-turn lane onto Route 109 to create space for a dedicated plaza turn lane.

The committee discussed the geometry. Ms. Obbagy noted that a second plaza entrance mitigates much of the issue. Mr. Goulet explained that even if a turn lane were added, it might not increase throughput during peak congestion. Ms. Guerette stated that shortening the Route

109 turn lane would increase backup at the light and would not materially improve plaza access. She noted the roadway already allows vehicles to pass a left-turning vehicle without crossing the fog line.

Mr. Temple commented that he routinely uses the second entrance for this reason.

The committee determined that no change was warranted and took no action.

Adjournment

Hearing no additional business, Ms. Guerette requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: To adjourn the October 27, 2025 meeting of the Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee.
SECONDED: *[Second not individually noted]*
VOTE: Aye (voice vote; no opposition noted)
MOTION CARRIES

The meeting adjourned.