Working Group Meeting #5

July 19, 2007
Meeting Agenda

- Introduction (Chris)
- Public Workshop / Info Mtg Discussion (Chris)
- Communications Sub-Committee (Jeff)
- Review Reasonable Alternatives (Trent)
- Group Breakout - Alternatives Ratings (Kerrie)
- Group Report - Alternatives Ratings (Kerrie)
- Assignments (Chris)
Project Development Process for Pelham

- Preliminary Design (2006-2008)
  - Placemaking
  - Problem/Vision/Goals
  - Alternatives
  - Public Hearing

- Final Design (2008-2009)
  - Detailed Design
  - Purchase Right of Way
  - Secure Permits

- Begin Construction (2010)
Context Sensitive Solutions

“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.”
“Consensus does not mean that everyone agrees, but that the principal groups and individuals can live with a proposal.”
CSS Steps

We are here

Brainstorm Alternatives

Reviewed Alternatives 5/17/06

Consensus Reached 5/17/06

Consensus Reached 2/15/06

Consensus Reached 12/21/06

October 16, 2006

Screening Criteria

Vision Statement

Problem Statement

Placemaking Workshop

Preferred Alternative

Public Hearing

Consensus Reached 10/16/06

Consensus Reached 10/16/06

Consensus Reached 10/16/06

Consensus Reached 10/16/06
Public Participation

- Public Involvement Plan
  - Introduction
  - Project Background
  - Project Team
  - Project Process
  - Working Group
  - Communication

- Project Website
  - www.nh.gov/dot/projects/pelham14491/index.htm
Format for Public Workshop / Informational Meeting

- Public Workshop - Afternoon Session (2:30pm – 5:30pm)
  - Informal, One-on-one Discussion
  - Laptops – Alternative traffic simulations, signal & roundabout presentations, roundabout video
  - Display Reasonable Alternatives – comment border
  - Handouts – screening criteria, PIP, project schedule
  - Comment Sheets
  - Refreshments
Public Informational Meeting - Evening Session (6:30pm – 9:00pm)
- Informal Presentation - CSS, PIP, Problem & Vision Statement, Screening Criteria, Alternatives, Alternative Ratings, Historic Resources
- Q/A Session - Feedback from attendees
- Clear Preferred Alternative???
- Comment Sheets
Communications
Sub-Committee Report
Review Reasonable Alternatives
Reasonable Alternatives

■ Roundabout Alternatives
  - Dual Roundabout Alternative A
  - Dual Roundabout Alternative B
  - Single 5-Leg Roundabout Alternative

■ Signal Alternatives
  - Dual Signal Alternative A
  - Dual Signal Alternative B
Alternative Screening
Criteria & Summary
### Alternative Screening Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Archeological Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept satisfies all element of the Project Vision Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreasonable</th>
<th>Reasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Consensus Reached**
The Pelham Town Center is divided by multiple intersections containing high volumes and speeds of local and regional commuter traffic, creating congestion that negatively affects safety resulting in unacceptable delays. This detracts from the historic character and setting of the Town Center. No “sense of place” exists that promotes community pride or encourages activities that attract pedestrians and groups of people to gather. This area lacks alternative routes, gateway, and traffic calming features that introduce and highlight the historic character of the town center. The area is marked by inadequate pedestrian/bicycle connectivity and amenities, and a complete lack of on-street parking, descriptive signage, and lighting.
The Pelham town center will be enhanced by changes to multiple intersections, which will make the town center safer and more welcoming to drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. These changes will enhance and preserve the small town character, historic setting and community aesthetics. Traffic movement for all approaches through the Pelham Town center will flow at a slow, steady, safe, and efficient manner for pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles.

Gateway treatments will provide an announcement to drivers that they are entering the Pelham Town center. The Town center will become a focal point that has connectivity and amenities, which contribute to a sense of “place”, history, and pride.
The purpose of the screening is to evaluate whether a concept is effective in addressing the problems and goals defined for the project. The following scoring criteria should be used to determine if a concept is reasonable and should be included in the range of reasonable alternatives. The criteria should be applied to each of the individual items listed within the fourteen categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(VP) – Very Poor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Flaw Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Opposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The individual category score should be determined by averaging the scoring from the individual items. This averaged category score will then be transferred to the category summary table and used to determine if a concept is reasonable and satisfies all the elements of the project vision statement.

### Access

- Evaluate the access provided to and from Businesses.
- Evaluate the access provided to and from Town Services.
- Evaluate the access provided to and from Residences.
- Evaluate the access provided for Commuters.
- Evaluate the access provided for Pedestrians.
- Evaluate the access provided for Bicyclists.
- Evaluate the access provided to and from Parking Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments: Category Score
Alternative Screening
Group Reports
Next Meeting & Assignment

Public Workshop
Thursday, August / September xx, 2007
Location TBD

Working Group Meeting # 6
Thursday, October 18th, 2007
Pelham Police Training Room

Assignments
1. Review Alternatives
2. Spread the Word
3. Attend Public Workshop / Info Mtg