



**NH 111 Corridor & Wall Street Extension Feasibility Study
Project Advisory Meeting
Windham Planning & Development Office
Minutes**

August 5, 2010

Members Present: Bob Ashburn, Bruce Breton, Sy Wrenn, David Sullivan and Kay Normington.

Project Staff Present: Laura Scott, (Windham); Gene McCarthy, Mike MacDonald (McFarland Johnson); Cliff Sinnott and Roxanne Rines (RPC).

1. Open/Welcome/Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and stated what organization they represented.

2. Communications/Public Comment

None.

3. PAC Meeting #8 Summary (7-1-10)

Members provided changes/corrections and approved meeting summary #8.

4. Future Conditions: Traffic model results for potential alternatives

McCarthy reviewed the long term projected traffic conditions based on the latest model runs, which incorporates the higher employment forecasts: no-build; Wall Street; 111 Bypass; and in-corridor. He explained the level of service of a roadway (how a facility is functioning), its all about delay. The scale is A through F; A being best and F is failing. Anything through a C is usually pretty good, even a D is okay in a urban setting and can be an acceptable desing standard.

5. Continued Discussion: Range of Reasonable Alternatives

McCarthy stated the no-build option needs to be kept as an alternative for comparison with the other alternatives. He presented a slideshow about each alternative with explanations.

In-corridor with signals: Signals would be put where existing signals are functioning, but widening 111 to a four-lane section. Four lanes are needed because signals require storage of cars during queuing. **Sullivan** stated this option is not viable and no further work needs to be done on this option.



In-corridor with roundabouts: There would be a two lane round-about at the Wall Street intersection; further west there would be a two lane section down to South Lowell. The roadway would consist of a single lane round-about with a two lane section of highway.

Another potential is to keep the signal at Wall Street, add the first (heading west bound) roundabout at the Post Office which would create a transition from highway to Village Center.

McCarthy showed what a two lane road on 111 through the village would look like: it would have single 12-foot lanes, shoulders (with bike path), curbs with sidewalks. It could also be done with a four lane section of roadway. There could be a continuous median down the center, but make roundabouts necessary to reverse direction. He continued that Route 111 needs to be kept at a very controlled speed because of the Village. By 2035, this alternative will hit its capacity because it is a single lane in each direction.

McCarthy stated he wants to bring just the most viable options to the public meeting with enough detail to give the public a good understanding.

Other Alternatives: four lane road section with two lane roundabouts; two lane road section with two lane roundabouts; two lanes on 111 with roundabouts and the Wall Street extension; the bypass; and then one that incorporates all of the above.

He asked which alternatives the committee would like shown at the public meeting in more detail. Committee members stated they do not want the 111 bypass; or the four lane corridor explored any further.

Scott suggested that when explaining delays to the public, it would be better to use time (seconds) instead of an E or F.

Discussion continued about roundabouts and how they work. **Scott** told members about residential developments that are appearing before the Planning Board in the near future. Discussion ensued about towns master plans and planning for the future.

McCarthy continued that the next alternate is the Route 111 bypass: two lanes of through traffic with signals. This would be a new road that would increase the traffic capacity. Members agreed that this option does not need any further study.

6. Schedule and agenda for Fall Public Informational Meeting

McCarthy stated he is going to further develop both the four and 2-lane roadways with two lane roundabouts and the in-corridor alternative with roundabouts and another with signals. However, the other alternates should be shown at the public meeting first and then present the committee's choices.

Sinnott stated there should be a progress report given at the start of the meeting reviewing what the committee has been doing since the first public meeting. There should also be a display of what roundabouts are and how they work available before the meeting start time.

After discussion it was decided to have the public meeting held at the High School on either Tuesday September 28th or October 5th; Scott will arrange for the use of the high school.

7. Recurring Business

- a. Task and Schedule update – **Sinnott** asked if it was feasible that the study will be completed by the end of the year (when the contract ends). **McCarthy** stated it is possible, but he doesn't want to rush the end results.
- b. Discussion at next meeting – **McCarthy** stated discussion should focus on what will be presented at the public meeting.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 2, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne M. Rines
Recording Secretary