

Mendon TAP TA22(17)
Alternatives Presentation Meeting Minutes
October 5, 2023 @ 6:00 pm

VHB's meeting presentation is attached for reference.

Attendees: See attached sign in sheet for in-person attendees; plus, Jennifer Conley (VHB) and Rose O'Brien (VHB). Several online attendees.

Welcome and Introductions: Jenn Conley, the project's lead consultant, opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda for the meeting (see slide 2). She then introduced the project team members from VHB, the Rutland Regional Planning Commission, Town of Mendon, and Vermont Agency of Transportation (see slide 4).

Project Schedule: Jenn C. reviewed the scoping study milestones and project schedule (see slide 6).

Project Purpose & Need: Jenn C. provided a recap of the June 2023 Local Concerns meeting and reviewed the project purpose and need statement resulting from that meeting. She explained how this guided the development of project alternatives (see slides 8-10).

Project Area and Overarching Themes: Jenn C. explained how the Route 4 corridor has been divided into three segments for this scoping study (see slide 11):

Segment 1 – Village Area from Townline Road to Meadow Lake Drive

Segment 2 – Transition Area from Meadow Lake Drive to Medway Road

Segment 3 – Rural Area from Medway Road to Fox Hollow Village

She discussed several overarching themes (or project elements) that can be applied to any part of the corridor – access management (see slide 13); safe crossings and transit stops (see slide 14), and climbing lane adjustments, which were noted as a long-term consideration for the project area (see slide 15).

Draft Alternatives by Segment: Jenn C. reviewed potential alternatives in each project segment that address the project purpose and need (see slides 18-36). A brief summary is provided here:

Segment 1, Alternative 1: travel lane reductions from ±14-feet to 11-feet, addition of a 2-foot buffer delineated by pavement markings, resulting in a 7-foot shoulder for on-road pedestrian/bicycle use.

Segment 1, Alternative 2: travel lane reductions from ±14-feet to 11-feet, addition of a 2-foot buffer delineated by pavement markings, shoulder reductions from ±6-feet to 4-feet, addition of a 5-foot sidewalk separated from the road by a 3-foot grass buffer strip.

Segment 1, Alternative 3: same as Alternative 2, expect addition of an 8-foot shared use path instead of sidewalk.

Locations for strategic crossings and climbing lane adjustments in Segment 1 were discussed. All three alternatives in Segment 1 are possible within the existing road right-of-way.

Segment 2, Alternative 1: addition of a 2-4-foot buffer delineated by pavement markings, resulting in a min 6-foot shoulder for on-road pedestrian/bicycle use.

Segment 2, Alternative 2: addition of gateway improvements to signal that drivers have “arrived” somewhere and amping up the buffer markings separating the travel lane from the shoulder.

Segment 2, Alternative 3: addition of a 2-foot buffer delineated by pavement markings, removal of ± 2 -feet of pavement resulting in a 6-foot shoulder.

None of the Segment 2 alternatives contemplated an off-road option for pedestrians/bicyclists due to constraints in this part of the corridor.

Segment 3, Alternative 1: travel lane reductions from ± 12 -feet to 11-feet, addition of min 2-foot buffer delineated by pavement markings, resulting in a min 4-foot shoulder for on-road pedestrian/bicycle use.

Segment 3, Alternative 2: addition of an off-road 8-foot shared use path on the north side of the road

Segment 3, Alternative 3: addition of an off-road 8-foot shared use path on the south side of the road

Locations for strategic crossings, transit stop widening improvements, and climbing lane adjustments in Segment 3 were discussed. It was noted that crossings would not be striped due to the speed limit in this segment and would have to be grade separated (i.e., either under or over the road).

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix by Segment: Alternatives by segment were evaluated against a broad range of criteria covering cost; improvement to pedestrian, bicycle, vehicle safety; improvement to community character; impacts to right-of-way, utilities, and environmental resources; and anticipated permitting. The results of this evaluation were presented in a matrix (see slides 38-46).

Public Input: Jenn C. led a discussion seeking 1) public input on the draft alternatives and 2) consensus on an alternative to recommend to the Mendon Selectboard to advance as preferred. Different combinations of configurations were discussed as well as project phasing. There is definite interest in enhancing the Village Area and leveraging possible connection to surrounding assets within Mendon and in adjacent towns.

Next Steps: VHB will take into consideration the input received during the Alternatives Presentation meeting and draft a proposed preferred alternative for the local steering committee to approve. Once the local steering committee is satisfied with the preferred alternative, it will be presented to the Mendon Selectboard for approval.