

Meredith US 3/NH 25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study

Project Advisory Committee Meeting No. 22

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: August 18, 2008
DATE OF MEETING: July 29, 2008
LOCATION OF MEETING: Meredith Community Center
One Circle Drive, Meredith, NH

ATTENDED BY:

Advisory Committee Members

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Chuck Palm	Meredith Board of Selectmen
Carol Granfield	Meredith Town Manager
Kevin Morrow	Meredith Police Chief
John Edgar	Community Development Director
Mike Faller	Meredith Public Works Director
Warren Clark	Meredith Citizen Representative
Robert LeCount	Meredith Conservation Commission
Linda Johnson	Meredith Chamber of Commerce
Fred Hatch	Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force
Roger Nash	Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force
Ken Renoux	Meredith Citizen Representative
Mike Iazard	Lakes Region Planning Commission
Rusty McLear	Greater Meredith Program

Others

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
CR Willeke	NHDOT
Cathy Goodman	NHDOT
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

CR Willeke opened the meeting.

2. Public Informational Meeting Preparation

Gene presented the notice for the meeting and how we plan to advertise the meeting. Notices and newsletters have been distributed and posted. He encouraged PAC members to distribute them to their constituents. There was a great deal of discussion about the public meeting, including:

- What about alternate routes. Gene mentioned that these are still under consideration and maps would be available for discussion purposes. Fred mentioned that the public needs to be aware that these are not easy to implement.
- What is the role of PAC Members. Gene answered that members should be present to hear what the public thinks of the alternatives. Members can also respond to questions about screening.
- Will there be visual aids. Gene said that there would be a presentation and boards posted in the room.
- Would this be a presentation only? Gene responded that the program would be to have an open house and then a formal presentation.
- Several members recommended that the meeting should be flexible depending on how many people attend.
- The screening to date would be presented to get the public's reaction.

Gene then presented the Questionnaire prepared to help get information from the public. E explained that the questions were chosen to get the key questions answered. It would be too lengthy and difficult to ask about every alternative and component. Comments and suggestions for the Questionnaire included:

- Roger suggested asking the public about the existing Parade Road Roundabout.
- The answers should be more than yes or no with the opportunity to add comments.
- Quality answers to a few questions are better than poor answers to many questions.
- There should be a question about the No Build.
- The public needs information before they can answer. Gene stated that the presentation would follow the questionnaire.

Gene agreed to refine the Questionnaire to follow the suggestions of the committee.

A motion was made to change the format of the meeting so that the presentation comes first and the public is informed before completing the Questionnaire. It was agreed to have multiple presentations during each session of the public meetings to give anyone who shows up the

opportunity to hear the presentation and fill out a questionnaire. Gene agreed to edit the meeting notice to reflect the new structure.

3. Dinner Break

4. Alternative Screening

Intermediate Alternatives

The committee continued screening the various Intermediate options.

Mobility

There was additional discussion concerning Mobility for Option 4. The committee votes to move Pedestrian travel from neutral to ½ red and the balance question from ½ green to ½ red. The wait time question for pedestrians was changed from neutral to ½ red. The Category score remained at ½ red.

Transportation Choice

The committee agreed with the initial screening for the “Transportation Choice” category.

Community Vision

Option 1 received all ½ green scores except for the rural character that was neutral. The overall score for Option 1 was ½ green. This score reflects the overall support for the three lane section but that the two-lane Roundabout at Route 3/25 was not well liked.

Option 2 received full green score for Meredith Village and Lakes Region character. The committee liked the option with the single lane Roundabout at Route 3/25. The four questions related to land use and growth all received ½ red scores. The committee acknowledged that the reduced capacity could have a negative impact on land use and growth. They gave Option 2 an overall ½ red score.

Option 3 received the exact same score as Option 1 since the only difference was at the Route 104/3 intersection.

Option 4 received full red scores for all questions except for Lakes Region character (1/2 red) and rural character (neutral). It received an overall full red score. The committee did not think a signal was the vision for the Route 3/25 intersection.

Support

The committee scored for the Public in Meredith and Public in the Lakes Region, but not for the resource agencies. It was felt that the overall should be scored even without the resource agency score.

Option 1 received all ½ green scores. The committee supported the three lane section and was comfortable with the two-lane roundabout at Route 3/25.

Option 2 received all ½ red scores. The committee supported the three lane section but thought the congestion that would result from the single lane roundabout at Route 3/25 would not be supported.

Option 3 received the exact same score as Option 1 since the only difference was at the Route 104/3 intersection.

Option 4 received all full red scores. The committee did not think a signal would be supported for the Route 3/25 intersection.

Final Determination

Option 1 was deemed Reasonable.

Option 2 was deemed Reasonable.

Option 3 was deemed Reasonable

No decision was made on Option 4. The committee wanted to see more traffic analysis to make a final determination.

5. Next Steps

Gene reminded everyone that the meeting with Michael Wallwork would occur on Friday, August 15 at 3:00 p.m. The Public Informational Meetings are on Saturday, August 16 and Tuesday, August 19.

6. Adjourn

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



GEORGE N. CAMPBELL, JR.
COMMISSIONER

JEFF BRILLHART, P.E.
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

Meredith 10430 US 3/25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study

Project Advisory Committee

July 29, 2008

Tuesday, 5:00 to 8:00 PM

Meredith Community Center
One Circle Drive, Meredith, NH

AGENDA

1. Opening / Introduction
2. Public Informational Meeting Preparation
3. Alternative Screening
4. Dinner break (6:15 PM +/- to 6:45 PM +/-)
5. Next Steps
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