

Draft 4.12. 2014

This document is authored by David Parry, 22 Main St, Southborough, under his own initiative. The intent is simple : to describe directly a “Local Plan”, instead of the previous descriptions (which are in the blue handout) which rely primarily on a long list of “eliminations” from the State Plan. **SO THIS IS MUCH MORE DIRECT AND FOCUSED.** This description is accompanied by graphic illustrations of the Local Plan and the State Plan, so they can be compared in scale, impact and cost. The ideas in this document come from many local residents and consultants, and it is fair to say that this Local Plan does enjoy the support of the majority of residents who live on Main St. Not everything that everyone wants is in here, but they can be added in Phase 2. This is Phase One. It is unofficial and DRAFT. Please send comments to: parrydavidw@aol.com.

AN EXAMPLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW.

A LOCALLY-FUNDED PLAN FOR MAIN ST IN SOUTHBOROUGH TOWN CENTER

Please refer to the three plans which illustrate this plan. The 3 plans are of ;

- 1. The 7 Easements Required under the State Plan.*
- 2. The State-Funded Plan.*
- 3. The Locally-Funded Plan.*

*For each Plan, there is one plan showing the full length – one mile long.
Each plan is also cut into sections, and enlarged, so providing more detail.*

1. THE LACK OF ALTERNATIVES AND THE NEED FOR LOCAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES:

A locally funded plan has not yet been presented, until now.

The Origin of the State Plan. State Funding Means State Rules Apply .

Town officials have never ALLOWED an alternative to be created, discussed or reviewed, throughout 8 years of planning for the State Plan. The reason for this is

because they are trying to get State funding, and that funding brings with it State rules on road design. Therefore residents have been told they cannot discuss any alternative outside the State rules, because they cannot be funded, and in addition they might “jeopardize” State funding. The same argument has been applied to making any repairs to Main Street for over a decade – they might jeopardize State funding.

The Worry of “Jeopardizing” State Funding is a Constraint Refrain.

But the fact is that even if we get on the State list, or move up or down that list, there is never a guarantee that we will remain on that list, as other more worthy projects move forward. We will not know if we are funded until the actual construction bids have been signed by the State, many years into the future. But Southborough has already spent \$450,000 in engineering fees just to get to the 25% level. There is a lot more to come.

Resident Participation in Planning Has Been Severely Constrained.

Therefore, every single one of the so-called public “reviews” in previous years has been conducted under the State rules. No other discussion was allowed. Residents did take votes over which of the State plans they preferred, and they did ask for changes, and changes were made, but in every case it was still always within the constraints of State rules.

The Review Conversations Typically Went Like This: “OK, you are asking me to choose which of two State Plans I would prefer for this block. Frankly, I really don’t like either of them, but you are telling me that the State rules won’t allow anything else, so although I would really prefer something completely different, I have no choice except to vote for one of these. So in that case, I vote for State plan # B2.....etc”

The Example of the Community House, With Parking Along Main St.

Mr Dennis Flynn, President of the Village Society, Governors of the Community House, stated clearly that he would prefer to keep public parking along Main St, both for public convenience and tradition. But, given the choice of having an additional 8 feet of asphalt which the State rules would require to be added to the already-widened street, he had no choice except to say “I don’t want the plan with the 8 ft parking lane because it makes the State road look even worse, Somehow we will have to build a new parking lot in our back yard, even though that is less convenient and costly. But you are giving me no real choice.”

2. THE BASIS FOR CREATION OF THE LOCAL PLAN IS PRESENTED BELOW. WHERE DOES IT COME FROM?

This Local Plan is based on hundreds of hours of conversations.

Mostly with residents of Main St, and some who live nearby, and some live far away. I have listed these comments in the blue Handout, which has been constantly revised. I have now drawn the Plan up in outline form, because I am an architect and have the skills,

but moreso because I realized that this wa the missing piece of the puzzle everyone was asking about – AND ACTUALL DESCRIPTION OF A LOCAL PLAN. .

The Suggestions Do Not Come From Me, But From Others..

They represent the opinion of the overwhelming majority of local residents who own property abutting Main St. Not every single person agrees with every single item. But this is a big majority. Clear, irrefutable evidence to this fact was heard at the meeting of April 2, 2014, when VHB engineers presented the State Plan, and residents voiced their opinions very clearly that they did not like significant portions it. . Selectman Rooney said at a recent meeting: I CARE MOST ABOUT WHAT THE RESIDENTS OF MAIN ST WANT, BECAUSE THEY LIVE ON THAT STREET. I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT OTHER OPINIONS MATTER TOO, BUT THE ABUTTERS OPINIONS SHOULD COUNT MOST SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY LIVE THERE.

So , Here It Is : Local Plan, Version # 1.

It is only one of many possible alternatives, and it is only an outline, and there can be many refinements and phases. It can start as soon as it is officially reviewed and endorsed by the Board of Selectmen. It relies on no outside funding, so it can begin next year. It asks for no more funding that is allocated to any other street in town for regular maintenance, except possibly in the case of problems that should have been dealt with decades ago. It focuses on the essentials, and can be phased over many years. It operates under no State rules, but only under the ONE local rule that applies when you do not have state funding – you must maintain the same level of safety.. .

This is not an official plan. It represents a majority opinion of local residents. This is the first Local Plan to be presented publicly because everyone has been asking asking – “What will a Local Plan look like, and what will it cost?”

Accuracy of the Plans Showing the State Plan and the Local Plan.

In the interest of space and time, it is far too complicated to describe the State Plan in detail, and what it proposes. The State plan is imply shown here in outline, but is accurately drawn. In the illustrations , use has been made of the original plans produced by town engineering consultant VHB. Tose ploans were placed end to end, to create the 1 mile long plan. If you look carefully you can see the outlines of each of the VHB plans. To look at the State plan details, please go to the town web page:
Southboroughtown.com

3. The GOALS AND OBJECTIVES WHICH ARE THE BASIS OF THIS LOCAL PLAN.

Rather than repeat these here, they are listed at the end of this description, because they are also OUTCOMES. They started as goals and I think they have been achieved to the degree possible. Go to the last page to se the list of bullets.

4. THE PURPOSE OF THIS EXERCISE IS TO COMPARE THE STATE PLAN, AGAINST ONLY ONE POSSIBLE LOCAL PLAN ----- A CLEAR COMPARISON IN SCALE, IMPACT AND COST

The color black is a good representation of two things: (1) asphalt or hard surface, and (2) cost. Compare the two plans, and it is obvious which plan is going to cost more.

The area colored in BLACK in each plan is the actual area of REconstruction -- that is, the area which is actually dug out by excavators, to a depth of 1 foot or more, and the resulting mix of asphalt and dirt is ground up, mixed, and spread back in. This forms a new, firmer foundation bed for whatever goes on top.

In the case of the **STATE PLAN**, what goes on top is the new, wider, straighter, road, plus new sidewalks next to the road with a curb between.

In the case of the **LOCAL PLAN** what goes on top is the new sidewalk, for instance.

Now let us compare the two plans

In the STATE PLAN, the entire area is colored black. That is because the entire area is going to be excavated -- including not just the existing road, but also the existing sidewalks, and landscaped strips, with all the trees cut down. Everything in the entire right-of-way goes. .

In the LOCAL PLAN, very little is colored black. . The only part of the road marked black is a tiny section by the intersection of Rte 85, and the 10 ft wide strip along the south side of Main. This 10 ft strip starts on the west end, just west of Middle Rd, opposite the common wall. It continues east all the way to Latisquama Rd.

In the LOCAL Plan, that 10 ft strip , shown as black, represents the amount of actual Reconstruction It is needed because it is the location of the new drainage swale, parking zone and pedestrian zone In other words, only this 10 feet strip needs to be excavated.

In the LOCAL Plan all the remainder of Main St is colored white. – NO re-construction needed. None of the other areas of roadway, shown white, needs to be excavated. None of the existing sidewalks on the north side need to be removed, The

trees can be kept. ALL the remainder of Main St can be resurfaced, as any normal street would be, and only when needed, not all at once (as in the State plan).

5. Now Let Us Go to Sub-Portions of the Plan, to Examine them in More Detail.

OPPOSITION FROM CONVENTIONAL TRAFFIC ENGINEERS CAN BE EXPECTED, AND IS QUITE NORMAL IN THESE SITUATIONS.

Residents should not be surprised to receive, and in fact should anticipate, all kinds of objections from conventional traffic engineers about this proposal. This is because many traffic engineers are in the habit of using state road rules and have little experience with traffic calming measures which are state-of-the-art in other areas of the USA, and specially in Europe and Asia. These new measures are only just moving into acceptance in USA. As we witnessed at the April 2 hearing, VHB has had very little experience in this area of street design most applicable to older, historic villages with narrow streets, which typically do NOT want to follow state formulas and do NOT want to increase traffic volumes, but rather they want to preserve and protect their quality of life and their environment. In fact, many towns and villages go out of their way to deliberately discourage thru commuter traffic and prevent vast increases in traffic volumes.

We MUST ALWAYS remember that under a Local Plan, we can decide what we want, and not what the State wants, or a conventional engineer wants. This is as much, or more, a MAJOR POLICY decision, as it is an engineering decision. We need to decide what Southborough, and specially its historic Town Center, should become in the long range future. So I fully expect opposition, and if residents want THIS vision, or one close to the vision proposed in THIS Local Plan, then residents MUST be prepared to push back, hard. It is OUR town.

A. THE INTERSECTION OF MAIN ST AT RTE 85.

(1) THE STATE PLAN.

LEFT TURN LANES . - The State Plan has 4 Left Turns.

STACKING LANES. - The State Plan has very long stacking lanes behind the stop line. The stacking lanes are needed according to State rules, to accommodate many cars all waiting to turn left, based on traffic projections decades into the future --- for example stacking lanes east, all the way to the Police Station, and stacking lanes south all the way down Rte 85 to near the Woodward driveway.

ASPHALT WIDENING. - The State plan also widens the approaches very significantly, with more asphalt,

TRAFFIC SIGNALS. -- 4 separate signals, hanging over the street. , on two very long boom arms, mounted on massive supporting posts. These will be very intrusive visually.

(2). THE LOCAL PLAN

LEFT TURN LANES. Just two (2), and much smaller in scale. .

The aim is to provide let turn lanes BUT with a minimal width passing lane to the right. Widen the approach to the intersection, just enough to allow enough space for cars to pass safely by on the right side. At present this is not possible because of a fire hydrant (see below). This passing lane does NOT have to be, and it should NOT be a full width passing lane, because the aim is to discourage speeding and volume increase. The sole intent is to allow cars behind to pass by on the right side of the left-turning car.

Driving behavior at the signal: If one car is in the left turn lane, then cars coming from the other direction will start to obey the reflexive and polite “driver courtesy” law: “The car facing you goes first, then you go second, then the next car goes , and then...and so forth”. This has been proven to work well, and in fact is already working at this intersection. Therefore we do NOT need a green left turn arrow. We just rely on human driving behavior. In fact, green left turn arrows just slow traffic down when there is no car waiting to turn left. .

(a). Left Turn for cars heading west on Main, wanting to head south down Rte 85. This simply requires the relocation of a fire hydrant from where it sits, now just one foot from the curb. Then remove the curb and add about 4 feet of asphalt , no more...i.e. add the smallest amount of paving possible to allow a car to pass by on the right hand side of the left-turning car.

(b). Left Turn for cars heading north up 85, wanting to head west on Main. This simply requires paving about 4 feet of road on the east side for one car length, before the intersection. Again, just enough widening and, no more asphalt than is necessary for one car to drive by on the right side.

STACKING LANES ...The Local Plan does NOT provide a full scale stacking lane behind the the car sitting in the left turn slot. This would ony serve to attractmorecars to take this route, and increase traffic volumes.

TRAFFIC SIGNAL. Keep it as ONE signal (No incese to 4 as in State plan). We can add a pre-emptive signal control system for the Police and Fire vehicles.

Other work near the intersection, , but not necessarily related to road work, and possibly scheduled for a later Phase , as funding allows.

NORTH EAST CORNER.

* Excavate and raise up the St Mark's stone wall by two feet for about 100 ft length. The wall has been buried by dirt.

* Clear out and rebuild drain inlet at NE corner

LIBRARY DRAIN. Connect existing drain under Library parking lot to suitable drain under street. (Cost of this not allocated to road). Should be done in Phase one.

SOUTH WEST CORNER. Move the pole and sidewalk back, exactly as shown in the State Plan, to broaden the curve. Simplify the design if possible to reduce costs. The town owns this property.

B. THE TOWN COMMON AND COMMON ST

Under the LOCAL PLAN, the stone wall does NOT need to be moved. It can be repaired in place, and only where necessary, not the whole length. This could be done at a tiny fraction of the cost compared to the State plan, Let us compare thee costs. Not only does the Local Plan keep the wall in place, but it also leaves in place all the other monuments, exactly as they are today, for instance the stone water trough, and the mile marker. The work on the wall itself is a small faction under the Local Plan as compared to the State Plan.

Under the LOCAL PLAN the wall is repaired in place. Very few rocks re removed. Work is only done where necessary.

No work needs to be done to Common Street on two sides of the Common because it is in good condition. .

Under the STATE PLAN the wall has to be removed in its entirety, very slowly, by hand, stone by stone, with each and every stone labeled and carefully stored. This is because it

is a designated historic wall and it must be put back the way it was. Then once taken apart, the new foundations has to be dug out and concrete poured in. The trees have to be cut down first..Then the wall has to be painstakingly rebuilt again, stone by stone, in the exact same order, then back-filled and new trees planted. Common Street is being entirely rebuilt on two sides.

Work on and around the Common under the State Plan is likely greater by a factor approaching 100. Not double, but 100 times as expensive as under the Local Plan..

C. WEST OF THE COMMON

In the LOCAL PLAN, notice that the entire west end is white. That means that NOTHING needs to be reconstructed. west of the common. Nothing at all. The Fay school sidewalk on the south side, is almost new. The north side sidewalk is not even wanted by Fay. The pedestrian crosswalk and lights desired by Fay can be installed whenever Fay wants, They do not have to wait another 4 years or longer. A pipe under Main will be needed for drainage from Fay's parking lots and and tennis areas situated north of Main, and also from St Mark's church parking lot, none of which have retention ponds for some reason. If he Town Hall and Pilgrim Church parking lots are a contributing factor, then they might be asked to contribute.

No under-street drains need to be installed west of the Common. No new road needs to be installed west of the Common. The abutters want the rainwater to flow into the existing wetlands, which is sound environmental practice. They do not want their wetland to dry up. The abutters also want the road left as it is, a country road: the original General Henry Knox trail. This applies all the way from Fay to Sears Road

D. THE PARKING / PEDESTRIAN WALK ON THE SOUTH SIDE.

We definitely need to do something about the "sidewalks" on the south side of Main St, from Middle Rd to Latisquama Rd..

1. EXISTING SITUATION. The north sidewalk is safe and suitably located against the stone wall. It is in good repair, and needs nothing done to it. It is protected from the street by a 5 to 6 ft wide landscape strip and trees, with an asphalt curb along the edge of the landscape strip. Nothing needs to be done, other than repairing the curb. The asphalt roadway is adequate width, but the problem is that it bleeds into the south sidewalk, in one continuous sea of asphalt, so they both appear as an ugly sea of black asphalt. Parking is provided by cars parking partly on the roadway, and partly on the sidewalk, leaving space pedestrians on the outside. The problem occurs when some vehicles

sometimes park too close to the outside edge, blocking pedestrians. This does not occur frequently.

2. CONCLUSION TO EXISTING SITUATION. The existing arrangement has worked for many decades, it provides for needed parking, the asphalt is ugly and in disrepair, and it is occasionally unsafe for pedestrians when cars park too close to the south stone walls.

I want to make one point very clear, because this might end all the feuding over which plan is "best". We have argued for 8 years because of the rigid State rules, which have prevented us from adopting our own, "hybrid" solution. The fact is that we have lived for a century with a hybrid solution that actually works, quite well. The solution described below is a "hybrid", closely based on what we have today, but it makes it more attractive, clearer, and safer, and provides a clear area for pedestrians.

3. PARKING IS NEEDED ON THE SOUTH SIDE

While this has been argued both ways, the majority opinion among residents is that parking is needed and desirable on the south side, where it has been allowed along most of the block.

This does NOT mean we need an exclusive, wide, "parking only" lane, with designated spaces, but rather that cars are allowed to park along the edge of Main St, on the south side --- just as they are allowed to park along most every other road in Town, , **REGARDLESS OF THE ROAD WIDTH.** There is NO bylaw in Southborough, prohibiting cars from parking along any street, except in rare circumstances.

Parking is needed for the following reasons: (1) The Community House, (2) for residents when guests visit, (3) for UPS deliveries, (4) for landscape trucks and trailers while mowing lawns, and (5) for parents picking up students from Woodward School, where the School pathway leads up to Main St in mid block.

4. BASIC PROBLEM SUMMARIZED

- (a) Parking needs to be accommodated on the south side.
- (b) The Parking solution does NOT have to be full scale parking-only lane.
- (c) The roadway is not wide enough to accommodate a standard solution UNLESS we sacrifice something : either eliminate on-street parking, or drastically reduce the landscape strip, or widen the right-of-way through land takings.
- (d) There is no clear demarcation between roadway and sidewalk on the south side.
- (e) A safer sidewalk is needed on the south side; (but NOT necessarily a standard sidewalk with a standard raised curb, but simply a SAFER SIDEWALK THAN EXISTS TODAY.--this is important to get clear, because a standard or conventional solution with a curb simply can NOT be made to work because here is not sufficient space.)

Note clearly – None of these issues could be addressed under the State road rules, because they simply do NOT allow anything other than standard, conventional solutions, with raised curbs.

TWO ALTERNATIVE PLAN SOLUTIONS FOR THIS PARTICULAR SECTION OF MAIN ST.

- (1). The State Plan does NOT and can NOT allow for parking, because of State rules..
- (2). The Local Plan CAN allows for parking because we have NO State rules.

(1). STATE PLAN WILL NOT PROVIDE FOR ON-STREET PARKING, AS WELL AS A PEDESTRIAN SIDEWALK, AND A LANDSCAPE STRIP WITH TREES.

The proposed state plan is to rip up everything, reduce the landscape strip on the north side, move the northern sidewalk against the street edge (where pedestrians would be less safe and splashed by vehicles during rain), then pave wider traffic lanes, plus asphalt shoulders. Then, on the south side, add 6" high, raised curbs, and a 5' wide sidewalk. The wider traffic lanes, the shoulders, and the width of sidewalk, are all required by State rules.

NEGATIVES: (1) The State plan leaves NO on-street parking, (2) it reduces the landscape strip, and (3) it makes the north sidewalk less safe.

POSITIVES: (1) The State plan provides a south sidewalk with a curb.

(2). ONE POSSIBLE LOCALLY-FUNDED ALTERNATIVE CAN PROVIDE FOR EVERYTHING : ON THE NORTH SIDE: SIDEWALK AND LANDSCAPE STRIP WITH EXISTING TREES. ON SOUTH SIDE: PARKING OVERLAPPING PARTLY ONTO PEDESTRIAN ZONE, BUT MAINTAINING A MINIMUM 4 FT FOR PEDESTRIANS ONLY.

Hybrid solutions have been successfully installed elsewhere, successfully, at minimal cost. First, local funding allows narrower traffic lanes, which can provide more space for parking. Other alternatives have avoided the conventional raised curb and instead used a combination of materials and more flexible, shared use arrangements. These are common in some new towns and villages, and are almost standard in European cities. Most travellers will have seen and used this type of shared zone solution. There is no reason why we cannot also do so. We not have to conform to the typical "standard". In fact, an argument can be made that because Southborough's Town Center is already unique, in many respects (eg 3 schools downtown, with historic buildings, all the civic buildings, grand open spaces and golf course, and a tiny, quaint downtown shopping block) -- so why should we hve to conform to the "standard" in our sidewalks ? Why not be unique there too ? Why can't we emphasize our uniqueness, attractiveness and difference from the "standard"?.

FOR EXAMPLE ONLY. Some towns have installed a new, clear, physical, demarcation line to show where the roadway proper begins, and where a SHARED parking/sidewalk zone begins. Examples of such demarcation lines consist of a row of cobble stones (or colored concrete with lateral serrations or bumps), which would function both as a shallow rain gutter and a “rumble strip”, so that the edge can be SEEN, FELT AND HEARD, and so that the outer 4 feet of the sidewalk can be shared between cars and pedestrians. This would leave the outer edge of sidewalk (farthest away from the road) to be flat and smooth, made of concrete, min 4 ft wide – which is wide enough for wheelchair access. Concrete would look distinctively different from black asphalt, so the entire roadway would not appear to be so wide. In fact the 3 feet of cobblestones and the 4 feet of colored concrete would make it appear to be 7 feet narrower. The concrete could be shaded pink and have a stamped, indented pattern to the top surface, so that it looks like a brick sidewalk, but is far cheaper than real bricks. The cobble stones can be set to create a shallow rain gutter, over which vehicles could park. They would be natural stone, and add a distinctive, unusual, natural and attractive feature to the road edge.

THIS IS JUST ONE EXAMPLE OF A HYBRID SOLUTION., which could, at one stroke, resolve the problem of sidewalks and parking, within the existing right-of-way, without sacrificing the north-side landscaping strip.

LOCAL PLAN IS FAR LESS COSTLY. How is it possible for this local solution to be less costly than the State plan solution ? This is simple to answer. Because the State plan digs up and rips out the entire street, including both sidewalks and the landscape strip and trees on the north side. On the other hand, under this hybrid Local Plan, we could leave the northern side of the street untouched, saving the landscape strip and trees, and the existing sidewalk – no need to dig it up and throw it away. No need to rip up the entire street. Just resurface the central part, and then install the new surface cobblestones and concrete walk on the south side.

This also has the advantage of less expensive operations for DPW: This plan can accommodate much cheaper snow plowing, because it would allow town trucks to drive over the cobblestones to snow plow the sidewalk area, very inexpensively. (In contrast, in the State plan, the 6” raised curb would prevent use of trucks over the pedestrian area. Instead the trucks will push all the street snow on top of the sidewalk itself: many feet thick, thus presenting an almost impossible task for a small sidewalk machine to handle.)

THIS COULD ALSO WORK IN FRONT OF THE TOWN COMMON AND MORRIS FUNERAL HOME.

Even to the west of Rte 85, this local hybrid scheme could work. The consequence would be that we would NOT have to move the stone wall along the town common, we would not have to lose common land. The Morris Funeral Home could also have its parking, almost exactly as before, but in a safer design. Whether they would have to allow a small

amount of their land to properly accommodate this solution is to be determined. But in any case the Morris Funeral Home are already providing land under the State plan. I

I suggest that this hybrid plan could be a “win-win” for everyone, and cost far less than the State plan. .

E. IS THIS LOCAL HYBRID PLAN LEGAL ?

Yes, it is. Remember two things under a locally funded design:

(1) In a local plan, we do NOT have to conform to the “standard” state rules : of 6 “ high curbs, and wider traffic lanes and shoulders. It is the wider traffic lane widths and the curbs that are causing the problem of narrowing the available width for car parking and sidewalks. Also, it is important to bear in mind that **narrow streets are in fact safer**. They slow traffic down, They narrow the cross walks.

(2) In a local plan, we must live by one rule only – we must maintain the same level of safety, and not decrease it. Here, in this hybrid solution, we are increasing safety, by the very clear demarcation: through 3 factors : sight, feeling and sound (it can be seen, felt and heard) . The cobblestones. This solution is very common in European towns with narrow roads, and where traffic calming is standard practice. Today this is becoming more common in US model communities, and is now considered the best model for these situations.

IN CONCLUSION THEREFORE, THIS HYBRID SOLUTION IS NOT ONLY LEGAL, BUT IT WOULD ALLOW THE PRESENT PARKING TO CONTINUE, AS WELL AS PROVIDE A SAFER SIDEWALK THAN EXISTING....WITH A CLEAR DEMARCATION LINE WHICH CAN BE SEEN, FELT AND HEARD.

It would provide a “shared parking zone”, which shares 3 ft of the asphalt roadway edge, and another 3 ft over cobble stones shared with pedestrians (when not parked upon), plus a separate NO-parking zone of 3ft colored concrete for pedestrians and wheelchairs.

That is just ONE possible solution under a locally funded plan. There are others.

F. Downtown Shopping Block.

During the planning for the "Locally-Funded Alternative", we must pay close attention to the future of the downtown shopping block, as in integral and important part of the town center. (BUT, to maintain a fair and accurate comparison of costs, we allocate the costs of that block to BOTH schemes, State and Local, because the State plan does not include that block.)

6. END RESULT—A PLAN PROVEN:

*** ECONOMICALLY VIABLE.**

*** DEFINITELY PREFERABLE.**

This alternative is not only a "fall back" plan, in case state funding is delayed even further beyond our control....but it is also a plan that can be proven economically viable and definitely preferably for a whole range reasons :

OUTCOMES. This Locally funded plan is designed to, and results in, the following:

- * Has ONE design rule (maintain safety), over a book of State rules.
- * Provides LOCAL control over design, timing, and cost
- * Safer for pedestrians than existing situation on deteriorated south sidewalk
- * Safer for pedestrians because less traffic, slower speeds
- * Inexpensive
- * Minimalist
- * Flexible
- * Allows our present use patterns to continue. (We do NOT have to "conform")
- * Focuses on the essentials
- * Preserves all our trees
- * Is more aesthetically attractive, than the wider state road
- * Enhances the value and reputation of all of Southborough
- * Preserves all our historic monuments exactly where they are.
- * Discourages thru traffic
- * Discourages increasing traffic volumes,.
- * Slows down traffic speed by means of narrow streets and physical obstructions, deliberately. This is what the state-of-the-art "traffic calming" is all about. We may even have to add even more obstructions (like speed humps) down the hill from Fay, and between Parkerville and Sears.
- * Can be phased over many years
- * Allows for immediate implementation
- * Faces far less opposition from local residents.

END