

Meredith US 3/NH 25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study

Project Advisory Committee Meeting No. 15

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: March 3, 2008
DATE OF MEETING: February 19, 2008
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
Kevin Morrow	Meredith Police Chief
Warren Clark	Meredith Citizen Representative
Sandra Sullivan	Meredith Citizen Representative
John Moulton	Meredith Citizen Representative
Bill Bayard	Lakes Region Planning Commission
Michael Izard	Lakes Region Planning Commission
Robert LeCount	Meredith Conservation Commission
Rusty McLear	Greater Meredith Program
Tim Drew	NHDES
Chris Williams	Latchkey Group
Joanne Coppinger	Town of Moultonborough
Robert Snelling	Town of Holderness
Fred Hatch	Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force
Roger Nash	Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force
Herb Vadney	Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force
Andre Kloetz	Meredith Fire Department
Mark Morrill	NHDOT

Others

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Jim Marshall	NHDOT, Project Manager
Cathy Goodman	NHDOT
CR Willeke	NHDOT

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
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/Introduction

Jim Marshall opened the meeting. He mentioned interest in starting the meetings earlier and having them end earlier. Gene mentioned that those who responded to the poll were split on changing the time. The conclusion reached was to keep the start time at 5:00 p.m.

Jim mentioned that tonight's meeting would focus on alternatives and that the March meeting would be reserved to address any outstanding questions related to the traffic model. Jim asked for any specific questions in addition to those already received. Below are the issues discussed.

- An overview of the modeling would be helpful to be sure all members understand the model and its results. Gene recommended that two scenarios be presented to show their differences.
- Explain why only one peak hour is modeled and how other hours can be evaluated. Gene and Jim explained that modeling another hour is time consuming and expensive.
- There was agreement that the committee needs to be comfortable with the Sunday volumes as well as the Friday volumes. There is belief from the community that the Sunday afternoon peak is worse than the Friday afternoon peak.
- The Four-Lane Scenario needs to be considered if it performs better than the Three-Lane Scenario.
- The effect of pedestrians cannot be forgotten.
- Travel times would be helpful if they can be explained sufficiently.

It was agreed that RSG would work to present answers to these and other model related questions at the March meeting.

Gene mentioned the publicity concerning the two-lane roundabout in Keene and the high number of crashes that have occurred since it opened. He explained that the two-lane roundabout in Keene is very different from the two-lane roundabouts under consideration for this project. Gene presented an aerial view of the Keene roundabout and explained it has free right turn ramps that are supposed to be used for all right turns. Some drivers are not observing the signs are entering the roundabout to make these right turns. Also, the signing and striping is set so that vehicles should not have to change lanes once in the roundabout. If drivers are in the correct lane as they enter, they should have no problem entering. The intersections in Meredith would not use these ramps and all traffic would be designed to enter the roundabout. Also, the Keene roundabout has much more traffic than Meredith.

The discussion of roundabouts shifted to the US 3/NH 25 intersection. Gene confirmed that the analysis conducted by Michael Wallwork concluded that a single lane roundabout would fail at this intersection for the Friday afternoon design hour for the design year 2030. Rusty stated that failure is based on the peak period only and questioned how much of the year it would function properly. There was belief by some members that a single lane roundabout could provide near year round benefit. Gene stated that the project team would investigate how much of the year it could work.

2. Alternatives Development

Gene began by outlining the options to be discussed at the meeting.

US 3 Three Lane Scenarios – Gene began by explaining the large drawing on the table represented the same three lane scenario presented at the last meeting. He presented a typical section explaining it included 5-foot shoulder/bike lanes on both sides of US 3. It also includes a wider, 14-foot, center turn lane.

He then presented a typical section that had no bike lanes and 1-foot shoulders. The center turn lane is only 12-feet wide. Gene mentioned that this was developed based on feedback from the previous meeting. The NHDOT has reservations about such a narrow roadway. There are safety concerns with traffic so close to a sidewalk. There are drainage concerns because catch basin grates are 2-feet square and would extend into the travel lane. Also, there is very little storage for snow. A plan using this typical section was developed for the area from the bridge over the railroad to the fire station. This area was selected because it is the most constrained portion of the corridor.

There was much discussion of the option with no shoulders. Some of the points made include:

- It may not be necessary to have sidewalks on both sides of the road.
- Some felt sidewalks were needed on both sides because people will walk on the side they want to regardless of whether there is a sidewalk.
- Mike Faller preferred shoulders at least 3-feet wide for drainage and snow storage.
- The committee members do not think there is an active bicycle community in the area.

The Three Lane Scenarios have one lane in each direction. Rusty asked why a two-lane roundabout is needed when there is only one lane entering and one lane exiting. Gene explained that the magnitude of turning traffic requires more than a single lane roundabout. A single lane roundabout at Route 3/25 would have a failing level of service while the two-lane has a high level of service and extra capacity.

3. Break

2. Alternatives Development (cont'd)

US 3 Four Lane Scenarios – Gene presented a typical section of a Four Lane Scenario that includes 5-foot shoulder/bike lanes on both sides of US 3. A plan view of the Four Lane Scenario was also presented. Rusty asked if the two lane roundabout at Route 3/25 could handle the traffic from the four lane corridor. Gene confirmed that it can.

A final typical section was presented showing the relative difference in width between the three US 3 scenarios.

Gene completed the discussion by presenting three renderings prepared by the project landscape consultant, Carol R. Johnson & Associates, of the US 3 corridor. Rendering 1 depicts the corridor with a three lane section and a moderate level of landscaping and aesthetic treatments. Rendering 2 is the same view as Rendering 1 but with a higher level of landscaping and aesthetics including street trees, which would require about four additional feet of width to accommodate. Rendering 3 is a view of US 3 and a roundabout at Route 3/25. The renderings are shown below.



Rendering 1



Rendering 2



Rendering 3

Vehicular/Pedestrian Underpass at Dover Street – Gene presented a variation of the Pedestrian Underpass previously developed. Mike Faller developed this concept as a way to provide the pedestrian underpass without having to raise the elevation of the municipal parking lot. Vehicles leaving the parking lot would have to use Dover Street and would have no direct

access to US 3. Gene presented the concept with Dover Street as a one-way street westbound. Several PAC members commented that Dover Street could be two-way from Main Street to the driveway into Mill Falls. The roadway under US 3 would be a one-way street.

Mike Faller explained that the vertical clearance for the underpass could remain at 10 feet, as developed for the pedestrian only concept. He felt this was a way to control the size of boats using the boat launch. Currently, boats longer than allowed use the boat launch are cause delays when they try to maneuver near US 3. A sign or clearance bar could be placed at the entrance to the parking lot to ensure boats and vehicles that are too tall for the underpass do not enter.

This concept requires boat trailers to use Main Street when exiting. Some questioned whether this was a good idea or possible. Gene stated that he checked for both passenger vehicles and RV's exiting assuming Dover Street as a one-way street. (He later checked assuming Dover Street as a two-way street and both vehicle types can make the turns, however, it would be difficult for an RV towing a trailer to make the right turn.)

Several PAC members were concerned over the restricted views and access as a result of a raised US 3. US 3 would be raised between 10 and 12 feet above its existing elevation near Dover Street. As large trucks drive over the underpass, they screen views of Meredith Bay. There was also concern that it creates a barrier between the downtown and the lake. The option of lowering US 3 was mentioned. Lowering the roadway could be possible, but flooding issues would have to be evaluated.

Chris Williams requested renderings or views of the underpass options from the Inns looking towards the bay and from the parking lot looking towards downtown.

Leavitt Park Road & Patrician Shores – Gene presented the concept that was shown at the last meeting that created a new road connecting Patrician Shores Circle to Leavitt Park Road. He explained that at the last meeting there was concern that the new road was too close to Route 25. Gene presented a section indicating the roads were 30 to 40 feet apart. He also explained that the final position of the roadway would be evaluated in more detail in the future if it is deemed reasonable.

Gene then presented an expansion of the concept where the new road was extended to the west at re-connected to Route 25 opposite the St. Borromeo Church driveway. This was an idea mentioned at the last meeting by Mike Faller. Gene explained that the road fits horizontally and vertically but does traverse through a private parcel of undeveloped land. Warren commented that residents in the Patrician Shores area may not like the extra driving distance if they are coming from Centre Harbor. Chris mentioned at option where the new road from the church intersection would become the new Leavitt Park Road and the new road from Patrician Shores would “T” into it.

Old Center Harbor Road Intersection – The Old Center Harbor Road intersection with Route 25 was identified as a safety issue. Gene presented a plan view of the area and explained that the issue is that there is a high point on Route 25 southwest of the intersection that reduces sight distance for those entering from Old Center Harbor Road. He presented a concept to

move the intersection northeast to increase the sight distance to a safe level for a 50 mph speed. The new intersection would impact a private parcel, but no houses or buildings.

Keyser Road Intersection – The Keyser Road intersection with Route 25 was another intersection identified as a safety concern. This intersection is located just southwest of the Old Center Harbor Road intersection and is affected by the same high point on Route 25. In this case the highpoint is northeast of the intersection. This intersection is located at the point where the speed limit on Route 25 changes from 45 mph to the northeast to 35 mph to the southwest. Gene stated that there is no simple concept to fix this issue and asked the PAC members for comments or ideas.

Chris asked whether it was possible to lower Route 25 to provide additional sight distance. Gene stated that this is a possibility, but it would cause impacts to private parcels. There is a home/business on the north side of Route 25 at the high point that may be impacted by lowering Route 25.

Gene mentioned a possible connection from Keyser Road to the Old Center Harbor Road concept previously presented. This would eliminate one of the intersections and place the new one at a safer location. This would be a new roadway through private land. The PAC members did not view this idea favorably.

Brookhurst Lane Intersection – Another intersection with safety issues is at Brookhurst Road and Route 25 near the town border with Centre Harbor. Gene explained that the issue at this intersection appears to be speed. The intersection is located where the speed limit transitions from 45 mph to 55 mph. Although the speed limit is 45 mph at the intersection, the road is wide and straight and most drivers are already accelerating to 55 mph.

Gene presented a concept to make this a more formal intersection with a left turn lane. The shoulders would be narrower, 4 feet, as opposed to the existing shoulders that are 10 feet. Gene acknowledges that the left turn lane does not address the main safety issue, which is vehicles exiting Brookhurst Lane to southbound Route 25. However, it does introduce a calming measure to slow traffic down.

One option mentioned was to simply narrow the shoulders in this area and shift the speed transition further into Centre Harbor.

Gene completed the presentation with a rendering of Route 25 with certain calming measures. The rendering is shown on the next page and was developed by the project landscape architect with the approach of using curbing, trees, and other plantings to create a more village type roadway.



5. Next Steps

The next meeting is scheduled for March 18 and will focus on traffic and traffic modeling.

The April meeting would fall on April 15 but the Community Center is not available. Members felt a meeting should be held and the Fire Station, Library and Church Landing were all mentioned as possible alternate sites.

6. Adjournment

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



CHARLES P. O'LEARY, JR.
COMMISSIONER

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



JEFF BRILLHART, P.E.
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

**Meredith 10430 US 3/25 Improvements
Transportation Planning Study**

Project Advisory Committee
February 19, 2008, Tuesday, 5:00 to 8:00 PM
Meredith Community Center, DW Highway, Meredith, NH

AGENDA

1. Opening / Introduction: Jim Marshall, NHDOT Project Manager
 - a. Meeting Start Time
 - b. Traffic Modeling Questions
 - c. Future Roundabout Presentation
2. Alternatives Development
3. Dinner break (6:15 PM +/- to 6:45 PM +/-)
4. Alternatives Development (Cont'd)
5. Next Steps: Jim Marshall, NHDOT Project Manager
6. 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

Gene McCarthy
Project Manager
McFarland-Johnson, Inc.
TEL: 603-225-2978
gmccarthy@mjinc.com

James A. Marshall
Project Manager, NHDOT
TEL: 603-271-6472
JAMarshall@dot.state.nh.us

Website: www.meredith3-25.com