

# Meredith US 3/NH 25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study

## Project Advisory Committee Meeting No. 27

### MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** May 29, 2009  
**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 2009  
**LOCATION OF MEETING:** Lakes Region Planning Comm. (SAU Conference Room)  
103 Main Street, Meredith, NH

#### ATTENDED BY:

#### Advisory Committee Members

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
John Edgar	Community Development Director
Mike Faller	Meredith Public Works Director
Kevin Morrow	Meredith Police Chief
Fred Hatch	Meredith Transportation Advisory Task Force
Rusty McLearn	Greater Meredith Program
Linda Johnson	Meredith Chamber of Commerce
Warren Clark	Meredith Citizen Representative
Sandra Sullivan	Meredith Citizen Representative
Mike Izard	Lakes Region Planning Commission
Tim Drew	NH DES

#### Others

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Jim Marshall	NHDOT
CR Willike	NHDOT
Gene McCarthy	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 the meeting would include a discussion of the Draft Summary/Classification Report and then a presentation on the strategy for Part B.

## 2. Draft Summary/Classification Report Discussion

Gene mentioned that the draft report had been distributed to the PAC for comments, but no comments had been submitted to that point. Several comments and points were then made, these include:

- Warren stated that he felt the summary should be moved from the end to the beginning of the report as an executive summary. There was consensus that this was a good idea. Gene stated that an executive summary would be provided.
- John stated that the traffic management components should have more emphasis. Web based information, ITS, message boards and others may become more important since the funding won't construct an entire alternative. Gene stated that more would be included in the report to explain how traffic management strategies could be used and how they would be evaluated in Part B.
- Rusty asked about the schedule and funding. Jim replied that there is \$5 million in construction money that is scheduled for 2011. He said that it is possible to make this happen but it is optimistic. It is more likely that the contract would be bid in 2011 with construction more likely in 2012.
- Fred wanted to know what happens to the report within the DOT. He suggested that the report be shared with all the experts at the DOT.
- The process to develop Sunday volumes from other information was not explained enough in the report. Gene stated that the final report would include a more detailed explanation of the process.
- John wanted to be sure Part B would not be an engineering only study. He wants the specific specialists that have been used in Part A to be available in Part B. Jim explained that the MJ Team has been retained for Part B and the scope is now under development. Gene stated that the entire team is intact, including Michael Wallwork, PPS, RSG, and AER (Russ Thibeault).
- The ownership and use of the report was discussed. Jim explained that the report belongs to the DOT, but that it is a tool for the town to use as well. Gene explained that the report is meant to document all project activities so that there will be no questions in the future.
- It was suggested that a list of the Unreasonable Alternatives should also be provided in the report.
- It was suggested that page number references be provided. Gene stated that this would be done, it was not done in the draft because the numbers will likely change.
- Fred mentioned that Level of Service (LOS) was not explained in the report. The different levels need to be explained in terms of the amount of delay. Gene stated that an explanation would be included.
- Fred mentioned that the existing No Build was not presented in the report. He recommended the current No Build traffic numbers would be beneficial as a benchmark. All agreed and Gene stated they would be included.

- It was mentioned that Part A went very slowly, was this planned? Gene stated that the CSS process is new and that this was one of the pilot projects for its implementation. He agreed it went slow but that much was learned in the process to help expedite the process. It was also mentioned that this part required more meetings to determine the problems and vision. The next part is more “meat and potatoes” and will move more quickly.

### 3. Break

### 4. Part B Strategy

Gene described the strategy that has been developed for Part B. The main points are that the initial step will be to develop a Corridor Plan that establishes the vision for the entire corridor. Once the vision has been established, priorities for its implementation will also be identified. The last step of Part B will be to complete a NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) document for those priorities that will be part of the first construction. The scope of the construction will depend on which alternative is selected and highest priorities. Several comments and points were then made, these include:

- John mentioned the importance of the formal purpose and need statement. Gene confirmed that the PAC would be consulted on the statement.
- The involvement of the PAC was discussed. Jim and Gene stated the PAC needs to be involved, but not as frequently as it was in Part A.
- Several members asked about additional traffic counts. Jim stated that additional counts would be done this summer for both Friday and Sunday traffic. The committee felt Saturday volumes would also be needed. Jim agreed and stated he would investigate the possibility. (After the meeting it was determined the LRPC would conduct daily tube counts and that the NHDOT would conduct intersection counts for Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.
- During Part B, Rusty recommended the meetings last longer to get more done with the fewer meetings.
- John mentioned the authority of the Corridor Plan. He stated that the NHDOT driveway permit process should follow the corridor plan to be sure the vision is kept. Jim mentioned that the best way to ensure this is to create a MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) between the Town and State that specifically references the plan. This has been done in other communities.
- John mentioned the value of having the NEPA document cover more than what is to be built initially. He sees an advantage to be “shovel ready”.
- Warren suggested using a “straw man” alternative to help jump start the process of selecting an alternative.
- John asked about the process to select a preferred alternative. Gene stated that criteria would be developed to make the determination. He said that one idea is to use a matrix where pertinent information for each alternative is presented. Information on cost, traffic, resource impacts, etc would be listed.

- John recommended using traffic measures that are more understandable rather than LOS or volumes. Comparing to current traffic was mentioned as an option.
- Fred stated that he developed a matrix to evaluate all alternatives in terms of traffic performance and how they scored in the screening. He found no correlation between performance and score.
- Fred asked whether tweaking alternatives was possible, for example, using a 2-lane Roundabout at Route 3/25 rather than a 1-lane Roundabout for the Roundabout Alternative. Gene stated that this is expected. Using a component that exists for one alternative on another is not a problem. Alternative will be evaluated in segments that can be interchanged easily for comparison purposes.
- The scope for Part B includes counting traffic this summer. These counts would be used to update the existing model. Current traffic volumes are down compared to the Part A base year, 2006. It was suggested that 2006 be used as the base year as volumes are higher. Gene stated that the team will be consulted to determine which base year should be used, or if it matters that much. Russ Thibealut, the project economist, will be asked for his opinion on this.

#### 5. Next Steps

Gene mentioned that the Final Summary/Classification Report would be developed and each PAC member would receive a copy. It was mentioned that copies could be sent to the Town Hall for each member to pick up.

Jim thanked all for their participation.

#### 6. Adjourn

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

# Meredith 10430 US 3/25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study

Project Advisory Committee

May 19, 2009

Tuesday, 5:00 to 8:00 PM

SAU Conference Room  
103 Main Street, Meredith, NH

## AGENDA

1. Opening / Introduction
2. Draft Summary/Classification Report Discussion
3. Dinner break (6:15 PM +/- to 6:45 PM +/-)
4. Part B Strategy
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: James A. Marshall  
Project Manager, NHDOT  
TEL: 603-271-6472  
[JAMarshall@dot.state.nh.us](mailto:JAMarshall@dot.state.nh.us)

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

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