

- Evaluation of motor vehicle crash rates at the Monitored Intersections; and
- The number of DSP vans ~~and Flex vehicles~~ traveling through the Monitored Intersections by time of day and direction of travel.

To the extent that any of the following conditions are documented in the Monitoring Report (each an “Unmitigated Impact”), corrective measures to reduce the Unmitigated Impact(s) (“Corrective Measures”) shall be proposed by the Applicant in the Monitoring Report:

- The measured traffic volumes for the warehouse (daily or peak-hour) exceed the projected traffic volumes by more than 10 percent (i.e., 110 percent of the projected traffic volumes);
- The volume of DSP vans ~~and/or Flex vehicles~~ using Gardner Street, Cushing Street or Whiting Street exceed by 10% or more the estimates presented in the Traffic Study; and/or
- The calculated motor vehicle crash rate at a Monitored Intersection exceeds the MassDOT average crash rate for ~~similar intersections as a direct result of the project.~~

The description of the proposed Corrective Measures, if any, shall include the appropriate parties responsible for implementation, required approvals, and the timeline for implementation. These Corrective Measures may include, without limitation:

- Sign and pavement marking installation.
- Traffic signal timing modifications at the Monitored Intersections.
- Enforcement of travel route restrictions for DSP vans and Flex vehicles to limit or preclude the use of Gardner Street and Cushing Street except for deliveries to addresses along these roadways.
- On-site operations and management strategies to include: expansion of the elements of the TDM program to include financial incentives for employees to car/vanpool; scheduling employee and truck operations to minimize impacts during peak-traffic-volume periods along Derby Street; evaluating implementation of an employee shuttle program; and other such measures that are designed to reduce the overall volume of traffic generated by the Project including, without limitation, modification of operations to comply with the maximum daily trips set forth in the Traffic Study.

The Town may, pursuant to MGL Ch. 44, Section 53G, retain the services of a peer review traffic engineer, at the expense of the Applicant, to review the methodology, results, and findings of the Monitoring Report. Upon written request of the Planning Board (or the town planner on its behalf), the Applicant shall appear at a duly noticed public hearing of the Planning Board to present the results of the Monitoring Report and to review any proposed Corrective Measures. If Corrective Measures are necessary based on the findings of the Monitoring Report after review by the Town’s peer review traffic engineer, they shall be implemented at the sole expense of the Applicant in accordance with the identified timeline. The status of implementation and effectiveness of the Corrective Measures shall be documented by the Applicant in the subsequent Monitoring Report.

Commented [A1]: It will be difficult to identify even well-marked “flex” vehicles since they are personal passenger vehicles that can be any make, model or color and are otherwise indistinguishable from any other passenger vehicle on the road.

Commented [A2]: It is unclear how this would be determined. If there is crash rate data for the monitored intersections, future data should be compared to that rather than “similar intersections” If there is no crash rate data existing, what would be the basis for a comparison to “similar intersections?” How is “as a direct result of the project” determined? Amazon should not be responsible or held to mitigation for crashes that do not involve Amazon vehicles.