KVPartners
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

# MEMORANDUM

**To:** **C. Terenzini, Moultonborough**

**From:** **R. Korber, KVPartners**

**Date:** **June 17, 2013**

**Re:** **Technical Memorandum #2 – Meeting Notes**
**Village Sidewalk Study**

---

The following are notes from the Orientation Meeting held at Town Hall on June 11, 2013 for the subject project. The notes are summarized by individual attendee and represent the key talking and discussion points.

1. Attendees: Carter Terenzini (Moultonborough); Bruce Woodruff (Moultonborough); Scott Kinmond (Moultonborough); David Bengston (Moultonborough); Len Wetherbee (Moultonborough); Mark Morrill (NHDOT); Mike Izard (LRPC); Joanne Coppinger (Petitioner); Kim Prause (Petitioner); Roger Hawk (Hawk Planning); Doug Greiner (g2+1); Ray Korber (KVPartners)

2. Purpose: To discuss and share available information and background on the Village sidewalk project.

3. C. Terenzini reviewed the project history, objectives and process. In summary, in accordance with Town Meeting, Town staff are to develop a plan for a sidewalk network in the Village area for presentation at the 2014 Town Meeting.

4. B. Woodruff:
   a. Reviewed the base map including map development, limits of study area, basis of information and mapping features. The purpose was to familiarize participants with the base map as it will serve as the primary tool to develop the sidewalk network and communicate same to the larger community.
   b. Reviewed the Town's Master Plan regarding objectives for developing sidewalks and pathways in Moultonborough. These documents represent the strategic goals previously established for sidewalks in the Town.

5. Joanne Coppinger and Kim Prause shared their viewpoints as petitioners regarding the development of a sidewalk network in the Village area. The petition was driven by safety concerns for children walking (cycling is not a primary concern) the Route 25 corridor between the Moultonborough elementary, middle and high school and the Town Library and Recreation Department buildings (Town complex). In addition, the petitioners believe there is a missed opportunity for developing the downtown area as a destination for Town residents and visitors who travel the Route 25 corridor; making the Village area more pedestrian friendly could achieve that.

6. S. Kinmond identified safety concerns between the schools and the Town complex as the critical issue. He supports a more pedestrian friendly area so long as the rural character can be maintained in

the Village. He also stated that the north side of Route 25 is probably the preferred location for sidewalk based on how local residents (youth, employees of the local business) travel through the corridor.

7. M. Izard shared some background on the Route 25 Corridor Study, the Safe Roads To School Plan and the Regional Bikeway/Pedestrian Plan. Regarding the Route 25 Corridor Study, while the key findings cited intersections as the most problematic issue facing Moultonborough, the Study did address pedestrian issues in a cursory manner. In summary the recommendation was to leave pathway development to the respective communities. He believes the priority should be safe travel through the Village area between the schools and the Town complex.

8. R. Hawk shared the results of the design charrette completed in July 2012. In summary, key recommendations cited were:

    a. The sidewalk network should be considered in the larger context of land use in the Village area. To ensure a vibrant downtown requires more business activity and medium density housing. He shared the recommendation and build-out scenarios as presented in the charrette.

    b. There is a need to establish gateways at either end of the study area to identify to the traveling public that they are entering the Village area.

    c. There is a need to slow traffic down to create safe crossings of Route 25. Possible solution is to reduce travel lanes to 10 (preferred) or 11 feet wide to slow traffic through the Villager area. This will require support from the NHDOT.

    d. Agrees that the sidewalks need to be done first but recommended they be completed with measures to reduce speed. He discussed several traffic calming measures (median islands, bump outs, landscape features, parallel parking, etc.).

    e. Recommended extending sidewalks on both sides of the road. Consideration should also be given to extending a pathway or sidewalk from the Academy to the Bank of New Hampshire or Taylor property.

    f. There is a need to develop a driveway management plan with sidewalk development.

    g. The construction of the sidewalk network could be completed in phases.

9. L. Wetherbee stated that the level of enforcement in the Village area is at its “saturation point” and that additional enforcement to increase the safety of the traveling public will have marginal benefit and is not advisable. He stated that crosswalks can be dangerous (users think of it as a “force field of protection”) and that the sidewalk plan needs to come with measures to reduce the speed of vehicles traveling through the Village area. Also if sidewalks are to be located in more remote areas, provisions should be made to gain access by ATV for emergency response.

10. M. Morrill provided background on what the NHDOT review process will be for work proposed within the NHDOT right-of-way. He also shared some key considerations for the development of the sidewalk plan including: drainage; location of access drives; places for parking that are accessible; vegetation control; utilities; and winter maintenance. In general he liked the concepts that were developed from the design charrette of July 2012. He could support an 11 foot travel lane so long as winter maintenance issues are address. B Woodruff also referenced buses as requiring 11 feet as they are 10.5 feet wide mirror to mirror. M. Morrill suggested contacted the Town of Meredith (John

Edgar; Mike Faller) regarding their experience with a temporary median and stamped pavement and the Town of Holderness regarding the sidewalk installed in the NHDOT right-of-way.

11. D. Bengsten stated that his primary concern is narrowing the corridor as this could be an issue for Fire Department response. In addition, he cited access to the sidewalk for emergency response as a critical element in the sidewalk development plan.

12. R. Korber sought clarifications on the key points raised by the participants and developed the following as a first pass on criteria/objectives/priorities that might be helpful in defining the project approach going forward:

    a. Keep kids safe.

    b. Be practical and cost effective.

    c. Develop a program that can get Town Meeting support.

    d. Maintain the rural character of the Village area.

    e. Ensure emergency response is adequate.

    f. Phase the program; set priorities for the build-out.

    g. Consider regional connectivity, but only where it is practical to do so.

13. Site Visit: B. Woodruff, R. Hawk, D. Greiner and R. Korber attended the site walk to assess the feasibility of alternative routes and to discuss existing site constraints, challenges and opportunities for a sidewalk network within the Village study area. There are no definitive findings to report.