

# Meredith US 3/NH 25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study

## Project Advisory Committee Meeting No. 13

### MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** November 26, 2007  
**DATE OF MEETING:** October 16, 2007  
**LOCATION OF MEETING:** Meredith Community Center  
DW Highway, Meredith, NH

#### ATTENDED BY:

#### Advisory Committee Members

| <u>Name</u>     | <u>Affiliation</u>                          |
|-----------------|---|
| Frank Michel    | Meredith Board of Selectmen                 |
| Carol Granfield | Meredith Town Manager                       |
| John Edgar      | Meredith Town Planner                       |
| Michael Faller  | Meredith Public Works Director              |
| Chuck Palm      | Meredith Fire Chief                         |
| John Moulton    | Meredith Citizen Representative             |
| Mike Iazard     | Lakes Region Planning Commission            |
| Bill Bayard     | Lakes Region Planning Commission            |
| Robert LeCount  | Meredith Conservation Commission            |
| Robert Snelling | Town of Holderness                          |
| Rusty McLear    | Greater Meredith Program                    |
| Linda Johnson   | Meredith Chamber of Commerce                |
| Chris Williams  | Latchkey Group                              |
| Roger Nash      | Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force |
| Herb Vadney     | Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force |

#### Others

| <u>Name</u>    | <u>Affiliation</u>      |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| Jim Marshall   | NHDOT, Project Manager  |
| Nancy Mayville | NHDOT                   |
| Cathy Goodman  | NHDOT                   |
| Bill Oldenburg | NHDOT                   |
| CR Willeke     | NHDOT                   |
| Erica Wygonik  | Resource Systems Group  |
| Gene McCarthy  | McFarland-Johnson, Inc. |
| Mike MacDonald | McFarland-Johnson, Inc. |

## **MEETING MINUTES:**

The Agenda for the meeting is attached. These minutes are formatted to follow the Agenda Items.

### 1. Opening/Project Overview

Jim Marshall opened the meeting. He reminded all members that the plans presented at these meetings were just ideas. Jim then introduced Gene. Gene asked if there were any comments on the previous meeting's minutes and also mentioned that comments could be sent via e-mail.

### 2. Modeling Overview

Erica began the modeling discussion with an explanation of unreleased vehicles. Unreleased vehicles represent vehicles that are trying to get on the road network but are prevented from doing so because of a blockage or queue. This statistic can represent the overall level of congestion on the network and measures the amount of unmet demand. A network with a significant number of unreleased vehicles indicates that more vehicles would like to use the roadway than can be processed by the assumed capacity. As with all model statistics, small differences are not significant and cannot be separated from normal variation in the runs.

Erica then presented two types of travel time statistics. Because of certain model parameters, collecting travel time directly from point to point is not feasible in this model, so two different methods were used to estimate travel times in the various scenarios. The first method measured the difference in travel times between two zones. This model can provide information about how long each individual complete trip, from the start zone to the end zone, takes. The difference in travel times to zones at either end of the study distance provides an estimate of the travel time between those two locations. However, because this method only considers the trips to specific zones, it only gathers data from a small percentage of the overall users of the study distance.

The second method was developed in response to the results of the first. The first method does not appear to include enough data points to override the normal variation. The second method collects the average speeds for each link in the study distance and multiplies those speeds by the link lengths. Summing these link travel times provides the total travel time for the section. This method has more statistical validity and is producing more consistent results.

Two new model scenarios were presented. Gene explained the first, a one-way version of the School Bypass. The existing portion of Route 25 from US 3 to Barnard Ridge Road would be one-way only in the northeast direction. The School bypass would be bi-directional with southwest Route 25 traffic using the bypass. This scenario was presented at the last meeting with a one-lane roundabout at the US 3/Bypass intersection. The scenario presented at the meeting utilized a two-lane roundabout at this intersection. Erica stated that the traffic flows fairly well with this scenario.

The video was shown and it indicated quite a few vehicles using Plymouth Street instead of US 3. Erica mentioned that it was at the edge of the model and there might be an issue with the coding. She stated she would look into this.

The other scenario was a One-way Pleasant Street scenario. This scenario made Pleasant Street one-way for eastbound traffic only. A single lane roundabout was used on the Route 25/Barnard Ridge Road Intersection, it did not meet warrants for a signal. It was asked if there were fewer lanes on the existing Route 25. Erica stated that there was one fewer lane.

A suggestion was made to consider a right in and right out only configuration for Pleasant Street at Route 25. This would eliminate the two difficult left turns at this intersection. Gene and Erica both thought this was worth investigating.

A question was asked concerning the cost difference between signalized intersections and roundabouts. Gene responded that it depended on the size of the roundabout and the amount of right-of-way needed for each. Roundabouts need more right-of-way at the intersection, but signals often require right-of-way to accommodate additional lanes for storage. Signals also have continued operations and maintenance costs associated with the signal equipment that roundabouts don't have.

The concept of an Underpass along US 3 was mentioned. One idea that was previously presented had a pedestrian only underpass to allow walkers to cross US 3 without interacting with traffic. Mike Faller described an option he envisioned where vehicles and pedestrians would use an underpass. The underpass would accommodate vehicles leaving the municipal parking lot and would have them access Dover Street instead of US 3. This would change the access, but Erica stated it would not alter the traffic much. A question was asked about how high US 3 would need to be raised to accommodate the underpass. Gene state that the option previously presented raised it 10 feet for pedestrians only. Mike Faller stated that his concept would not require standard vertical clearance, but it was mentioned that it would need to accommodate the tallest boats that use the boat launch.

### 3. Alternatives Modeling

Gene began by presenting a No Build plan. This was a corridor color plan highlighting the existing roadways and buildings. He stated that this format would be the basis for presenting alternatives. He then described the first corridor scenario, the Three-lane Intermediate Scenario, which has been developed. He presented a typical section and typical plan view for a three-lane section along US 3. The scenario included the following:

- One 11-foot wide northbound lane
- One 11-foot wide southbound land
- One 14-foot wide center turn lane or median
- Two 5-foot wide bike lanes/shoulders on each side
- Two 5-foot wide sidewalks on each side

There were several comments/questions regarding the bike lanes and sidewalks. The total width for both sidewalks and both bike lanes is 20 feet. Several members wondered if these

could be combined in some way to reduce the width. Gene stated that it is possible, however, bi-directional bike lanes are difficult when they are part of the vehicular roadway. Also, bi-directional and multiple use lanes need to be wider. Most agreed that bike lanes and sidewalks are desirable, but the project should look at all options to provide them.

Next, Gene focused on the corridor plan developed for the Three-lane Intermediate Scenario. He first mentioned that this scenario used two-lane roundabouts at the Route 104/US 3 Intersection, the US 3/Route 25 Intersection, and the Route 25/Pleasant Street Intersection. Michael Wallwork developed these layouts and felt the two-lane roundabouts functioned best at the three locations. Rusty asked why a two-lane roundabout is needed for a one lane road. It was explained that the approaches are widened to two lanes.

#### 4. Break

#### 3. Alternatives Modeling (cont'd)

After the break, Gene started at the Route 104/US 3 Intersection and proceeded along the corridor explaining the proposed layout. Below are the items discussed:

- The proposed Route 104/US 3 Roundabout has a 180-foot diameter and does not need a truck apron because of its size. It fits within the existing right-of-way and has a large center island that could be used for a gateway statement to downtown. Sidewalks were not shown approaching the roundabout but were accommodated within the roundabout. Mike Faller stated that they could be attached to the existing sidewalks near Ladd Hill Road. A question was asked when a roundabout becomes a traffic circle. Gene responded by stating it is more about speed than size. Roundabouts require slow moving vehicles and the geometry forces drivers to go slow.
- Several members mentioned that many parking lots are known to be on state property. Gene mentioned that he now has property and right-of-way information but did not include it on the plans. Gene discussed the parking in front of the League of NH Craftsmen store. This parking configuration with parking directly from US 3 is not desirable. Rusty mentioned that their property does extend into the Church Landing parking lot and these are available for their customers. Gene presented an alternate design that would require the parking to access from the Church Landing driveway. Rusty believes this would hurt their business and they would be against it.
- John Edgar mentioned that there seem to be more pedestrians along the upper portion of US 3. He also feels that the signal timing is such that it can be difficult to get onto US 3 from Oak Street. Could Oak Street be closed off? Gene stated that the roundabout provided slow steady traffic so this would not necessarily alleviate this issue. A pedestrian signal could provide the necessary gaps.
- The parking for the businesses in the town docks area on the east side of US 3 were discussed next. Gene presented the proposed design that sought to organize the drives and parking to make it easier to understand and safer for drivers and pedestrians. In achieving this while widening US 3, parking spaces were lost in several of the parking lots for the adjacent businesses. Gene recognized that there are no easy answers. The presented plans strive to sustain the existing businesses. Rusty mentioned that many of

the parking spaces are likely occupied by business employees. Employees could be required to park elsewhere and leave the parking for patrons.

- The sidewalks from Church Landing to the town boardwalk were discussed. The proposed plan indicated sidewalks on both sides of US 3. Options mentioned included having the sidewalk on one side only or having the west side for fast walkers and the east side along the boardwalk for casual walkers. One idea was to direct casual walkers to the boardwalk that begins at Church Landing and have them be able to walk along the lake all the way to Route 25.
- The area in front of the town docks was discussed. The plan presented had two crosswalks, one at Lake Street and one at Dover Street. Gene mentioned the concept of pedestrian signals at these two crossings to help pedestrians cross US 3, with the added benefit of creating gaps for the roundabouts. Gene stated that this is still under evaluation.
- Mike Faller mentioned that at times the Dover Street intersection with US 3 is closed. Could this be done permanently? Could the median be extended past Dover Street to eliminate left turns? This idea was well received. It was also mentioned that roundabouts could be used to make U-turns if roads were cut-off like this. Mill Street was mentioned as a possibility. Gene stated that Mill Street makes sense, except that it is not an ideal place for a roundabout because it is on a curve and sight distance could be an issue. Frank Michel said closing Dover Street on weekends could address the problem. The idea of managing the pedestrians during peak periods was mentioned.
- The Boat Launch was mentioned but Gene stated the presented plan simply accommodated it. The ideas about how it could be managed or eliminated are still on the list for consideration.

Gene presented two roundabout models for the US 3/Route 25 Intersection. One model was for the Friday pm peak period and one was for the Sunday pm peak period. Rusty asked how much more traffic can a two-lane roundabout handle compared to a one-lane roundabout. Bill Oldenburg stated that it can handle about 80% more traffic. Linda wondered if the layout could be changed to impact one building rather than two. Gene stated that the center of the roundabout can be moved to alter impacts. He mentioned that the direction given Michael Wallwork was to place it in its optimal location for the first layout.

## 5. Alternatives Development

Time ran out before this item was presented.

## 6. Next Steps

Jim Marshall closed the meeting by discussing the schedule. Possible dates for the next meeting are December 7, 12 or 13. December 12 was felt to be the best date.

## 6. Adjournment

Submitted by,  
Gene McCarthy, P.E.  
McFarland-Johnson, Inc.



THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



CHARLES P. O'LEARY, JR.  
COMMISSIONER

Meredith 10430 US 3/25 Improvements  
Transportation Planning Study

JEFF BRILLHART, P.E.  
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

Project Advisory Committee

October 16, 2007

Tuesday, 5:00 to 8:00 PM

Meredith Community Center  
DW Highway, Meredith, NH

AGENDA

1. Opening / Introduction: Nancy Mayville, Municipal Highways Engineer
2. Alternatives Modeling: Gene McCarthy and Erica Wygonik, Resource Systems Group
3. Alternatives Development
4. Dinner break (6:15 PM +/- to 6:45 PM +/-)
5. Alternatives Development (Cont'd)
6. Next Steps: Jim Marshall, NHDOT Project Manager
7. Adjourn (8:00 PM)

**Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)** is defined as *"a collaborative interdisciplinary approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility."*

Contacts: Nancy Mayville  
Municipal Highways Engineer  
NHDOT  
TEL: 603-271-1609  
[NMayville@dot.state.nh.us](mailto:NMayville@dot.state.nh.us)

Gene McCarthy  
Project Manager  
McFarland-Johnson, Inc.  
TEL: 603-225-2978  
[gmccarthy@mjinc.com](mailto:gmccarthy@mjinc.com)

James A. Marshall  
Project Manager  
NHDOT  
TEL: 603-271-6472  
[JAMarshall@dot.state.nh.us](mailto:JAMarshall@dot.state.nh.us)

Website: [www.meredith3-25.com](http://www.meredith3-25.com)