PROJECT/DESCRIPTION **604531 ASSABET RIVER RAIL TRAIL**_____

25%TRAFFIC ENGINEERING REVIEW CHECKLIST Submission Date 11/08/11

PURPOSE

The 25% Traffic Engineering Review is intended to provide MassDOT the opportunity to evaluate the proposed design and Functional Design Report relative to current design standards, operation impacts, safety impacts and other potential community concerns associated with the proposed design.

GENERAL

This checklist represents the minimum amount of issues that should be considered when reviewing a 25% traffic submittal. The information below is not intended to address all aspects of report or plan preparation. To the extent practical, any comments relative to plan preparation made at the 25% stage will certainly improve the quality of the 75% submittal.

Any question listed below with a No or N/A answer requires a written comment.

I. Functional Design Report

	Yes	No	N/A	A. Existing Conditions
1	X			Is a description of the project study area included?
				Comment:
2	X			Is the project location (locus) map included?
				Comment:
3	X			Is a discussion of existing deficiencies and an evaluation of the existing signs, signals and markings
				Comment:

	Yes	No	N/A	B. Traffic Volumes
4	X			Is the traffic count data less than 2 years old from the date of FDR submission?
				Comment:
5			X	Are the Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Counts included for the minor street approach for signalized intersections?
				Comment: No signalized intersections at critical trail crossing locations.
6	X			Are Manual Turn Movement Counts (TMC): Peak hour data for all study intersections included?
				Comment:
7	X			Are Peak Hour Factors (PHF) identified?
				Comment:
8	X			Are heavy vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian count data included in the TMC?
				Comment:
9	X			Do the base year volumes represent an average month during the year the FDR is submitted or no more than 2 years for MEPA permitted projects?
				Comment:
10	X			Have seasonal factors been reviewed and applied as necessary?
				Comment:
11	X			Do the future year volumes represent a minimum of 7 years from the base year?
				Comment:
12	X			Do the future year volumes include background growth and site development as necessary?
				Comment:
13			X	Are trip generation/distribution data for private development trips schematically displayed on the network?
				Comment: No significant private development anticipated in the project area.
14	X			Are base year and future year traffic volume networks provided?
				Comment:

	Yes	No	N/A	C. Safety Analysis
15	X			Are three years of Crash Data analyzed for project locations? (5 years is preferred)
				Comment:
16	X			Are crash rate calculations included for all study area intersections and segments?
				Comment:
17			X	Are collision diagrams provided for all study area intersections with more than 3 crashes per year?
				Comment: None of the itersections experienced 3 or more crashes per year during the years evaluated.
18			X	Is a collision map provided for all study area segments?
				Comment: Project is a proposed trail, no roadway segments included.
19		X		Was the Safety Review Prompt List utilized during a site visit?
				Comment: Roadway safety improvements is not the focus of this project.
20			X	Is discussion regarding the Safety Review Prompt List included?
				Comment: See response to No. 19

	Yes	No	N/A	D. MUTCD Signal Warrants
21			X	Is traffic count data provided for a minimum of the 8 highest hours for the major streets and minor street?
				Comment: Full intersecton traffic signal control is not proposed for this project. Beacons proposed at critical crossing location.
	X			
22				Was the minor street count data collected by a manual turning movement count method?
				Comment:
23	X			Does the signal warrant analysis follow procedures from MUTCD?
				Comment:
24		X		Do proposed signal installations meet an 8-hour volume warrant?
				Comment: See response to No. 21

	Yes	No	N/A	E. Operational Analysis
25	X			Are the intersection approaches evaluated using observed/appropriate peak hour factors?
				Comment:
26	X			Are heavy vehicle percentages used in the analyses?
				Comment:
27	X			Are pedestrian volumes and phasing incorporated into the analyses?
				Comment:
28	X			Are capacity analyses completed for all the required analysis scenarios?
				Comment:
29	X			Do capacity analyses reflect the existing and proposed geometry conditions?
				Comment:
30			X	Are coordinated signals/closely spaced intersections evaluated under a systems analysis?
				Comment: No systems are included in this project
31	X			Are the 50th and 95th percentile vehicle queues documented?
				Comment:

	Yes	No	N/A	F. Proposed Design
32	X			Is a description of the proposed geometric changes and/or alternative designs included?
				Comment:
33	X			Is a narrative describing the pedestrian and bicycle accomodation improvments included?
				Comment:
34	X			Is discussion included of how the proposed design will alter the traffic control conditions?
				Comment:
35			X	Was a roundabout design an alternative considered?
				Comment: Proposed project is a new trail, not an intersection improvement project.
36			X	Are the Section 61 Findings attached for the Private Development projects?
				Comment: Not a private development project.
37			X	Do all traffic calming design treatments (where allowed) follow the Traffic Calming Guidelines?
				Comment: No traffic calming measures are proposed.
38	X			Do all study area intersections include corrective design measures?
				Comment:
39	X			Has "work to be done by others" been factored into schedule/design?

Comment: _____

	Yes	No	N/A	G. Traffic Management
40	X			Is a Construction Management Outline included?
				Comment:
41			X	Are the appropriate traffic counts and capacity analyses included?
				Comment: No analysis required for the anticipated roadway impacts.

II. 25% Design Plans

	Yes	No	N/A	A. Basic Design Plan Set
42	X			Does the plan set follow the preparation guidelines specified in the current Project Development and Design Guidebook?
				Comment:
43	X			Do the plans provide linework and details of the existing conditions for use in reference to the proposed design?
				Comment:
44	X			Do the proposed roadway cross-sections conform to current standards?
				Comment:
45	X			Are provisions made for bicycle accommodation where applicable?
				Comment:
46	X			Do pedestrian facilities meet the Massachuesetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB) standards?
				Comment:

	Yes	No	N/A	B. Traffic Signal Plans
47	X			Do the plans indicate the proper placement of the signal heads?
				Comment: Flashing beacon proposed at critical trail crossing location.
48	X			Are the signal head configurations in conformance with the MUTCD standards?
				Comment:
49	X			Do the signal layout plans show the proposed lane assignments and stop lines?
				Comment:
50			X	Is the Sequence and Timing Chart provided on the plans?
				Comment: See comment response for No. 47.
51	X			Is the Preferential Phasing Diagram, including pedestrian phases, shown on the signal plan?
				Comment:
52				Is a Time-Space Diagram for the interconnected signals included?
				Comment: See comment response for No. 47.
53	X			Is signal detector type and location included on the signal plans?
				Comment:

	Yes	No	N/A	C. Traffic Management Plans (TMP)
54	X			Are preliminary Temporary Traffic Control Plans provided?
				Comment:
55	X			Do the typical layouts follow MassDOT's Standard Details and Drawings for the Development of TMP's?
				Comment:
56			X	If required, have the detour routes been clearly defined?
				Comment: No detours are proposed.
57	X			Is pedestrian and bicycle accommodation maintained during construction?
				Comment: