



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

March 25, 2010

Members Present: Bob Ashburn, Bruce Breton, David Sullivan, Annette Stoller, Sy Wrenn and Bob Winmill.

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

Meeting Opened at 9:04 a.m.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Sinnott welcomed everyone and introduced Gene McCarthy of McFarland Johnson, consultant. Attendees introduced themselves and stated what organization they represented.

2. Public Comment; Other Communications

None.

3. PAC Meeting #4 Summary (02-18-10)

Minutes accepted as written.

Sinnott stated that at the last meeting Laura Scott asked about how model assumptions on the project number of future households compared to the build-out analysis. He distributed a map that showed different traffic analysis zones and reviewed the comparison between the model and build-out numbers. The outcome is that they numbers are very close, especially considering that they are derived from completely difference sources and methods.

McCarthy stated if everyone is comfortable with the projected build-out numbers to 2035, then the transportation model doesn't need to be re-done or updated. Discussion ensued amongst members. L. Scott stated that she has received feedback from one local developer and there may be additional input.

4. **Adopt final Problem Statement & Vision Statement**

McCarthy explained the changes that were made according to the Committee's comments at the last meeting. He asked members for any further comments. **Stoller** mentioned a grammatical error. **Scott** asked that further wording be changed.

McCarthy stated he will make the suggested changes and that the document can be modified in the further if need be. Members agreed to accept the document with the above changes.

5. **Continued discussion: Traffic Modeling Results**

Existing and Future volumes/ No-Build Intersection analyses – **McCarthy** continued with the discussion that was started earlier in the meeting. He explained current and future traffic volume numbers and how it will affect traffic throughout Windham. Members asked questions concerning different roads and intersections and discussion ensued.

6. **Continued discussion: Future Land Use and Development Assumptions (for Modeling)**

Discussed earlier in the meeting.

7. **Resources Inventory for project area**

Chase presented a slideshow and explained the findings of her inventory. Key results of the natural resources inventory were reviewed at various locations, focusing on the Wall Street extension corridor and the town center bypass corridor. She summarized that parts of both potential alignments involved significant resource impacts, particularly for wetlands. They will weigh into considering the feasibility and "permit-ability" of alternatives. Members asked questions during the presentation and discussion ensued.

8. **Preliminary Discussion of Alternatives**

McCarthy stated a document needs to be created that gives more detailed information about how wide the roads will need to be, including intersections and configurations, in the design year to accommodate future traffic volumes. Once the committee decides on the details about proceeding, McFarland-Johnson will present the committee with a document for review and eventual approval. Also included will be long term recommendations for the area. He also asked the committee to be specific about the existing 111 corridor.

Wrenn asked how feasible the environmental obstacles are. **McCarthy** stated nothing is impossible, the process and the project purpose/need that must be demonstrated to the resource agencies will need to be compelling and clearly show a thorough examination of alternatives and to show that the benefits will outweigh the environment consequences. **Sinnott** gave suggestions to the committee about listing the benefits in the alternatives document.

McCarthy stated resources are going to be impacted no matter what alternative is preferred. Discussion ensued amongst members and staff. There was detailed discussion about existing traffic roundabouts and how they work. If there are two alternatives with very different costs, which one by cost would the state be more inclined to accept? **Sinnott** stated the least expensive and the one with the least amount of impacted resources would probably get permitted faster.

9. Recurring Business

- a. Task and Schedule Update: **McCarthy** said there were no significant changes to the project schedule since last meeting;
- b. Project Website: **Sullivan** said that materials for posting on the Town's website should be sent directly to Wendy Devlon wdevlon@windhamnewhampshire.com. Site should include the project scope, agenda, minutes, member list and contact info and presentations.
- c. Contract Extension: **Sinnott** stated the extension was not on the March G&C agenda and didn't know why; expected in April.
- d. Committee hours: Scott asked all member to send her a summary of their hours. She is will compile and send to Sinnott for grant invoicing purposes.

10. Next Meeting: THURSDAY MAY 6th, 2010, 4:30PM

11. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne M. Rines
Recording Secretary