

Hyde Park Village Roads Working Group
MEETING MINUTES
October 24, 2016

All minutes are draft until approved; please check future minutes for approval of these minutes.

Members Present: Lucy Hankinson, Jim Fontaine, Ken McPherson, Susan Bartlett, Tim Yarrow
Members Absent: Dan Young
Staff: Ron Rodjenski, Town Administrator
Guests: None

Lucy called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

1. **Welcome, Modifications to Agenda and Public Comment.** No changes to the agenda were made and no public comment was received.
2. **Review the Minutes:** Motion by Jim to approve the 09/26/2016 minutes, as written. Seconded by Susan. Voting: 5 in favor, 0 against, motion passed.
3. **Town and Village Comprehensive Development Plan:** Lucy asked if everyone had a chance to review the Plan and how it relates to this group's effort to facilitate village street improvements. Jim said he read it but he wanted to discuss the group's purpose, such as will a written report need to be agreed upon by all members. Tim stated that recommendations will be brought to both boards. Ken asked if the report would be a consensus report with a mission statement and group recommendations. Tim agreed it should be written down. Ken asked if there could be disagreement on the recommendations, such as a 5 – 1 vote, to put forward a recommendation to the boards. Susan noted that a consensus report could be put together even with some notations of disagreement or dissent. Ken suggested that reporting out through a PowerPoint presentation to the boards would be effective. Jim offered that to provide residents with a full understanding of the committee's work, a list of each village road and the actions to be recommended for it would help, even if the group recommended no action on some roads. Susan agreed, the report would reflect current conditions and recommendations for each road could be amended in the future. Lucy stated that her take-away from the Plan review was: priorities for a walkable village, a vibrant downtown, consideration for the use of narrower roads and wider sidewalks. Ken noted that with those types of changes to traffic must still result in good traffic flow in and out of the Village, and if too slow, it might deter traffic. Jim offered that with six village entrances (seven if Black Farm Road is included), consideration could be given to removing one entrance or making a street one-way, especially if a high accident condition. Susan stated that Morrisville makes use of signage to draw travelers off the new bypass. Jim noted that plows would need turnarounds if roads are closed and any changes could negatively impact emergency services. Tim noted that when Cady's Falls bridge re-opens, the Village will see an increase in traffic. Jim noted that regional planning has a Main St traffic volume report from 2014 at 1,200 trips per day. Susan asked what the goal of this committee should be – to make improvements for walk-ability and if so, what does that mean? Ken asked that questions is what is the Village going to look like in the future? Ken asked if it will be a cultural center, noting that there is not a lot of demand for that right now. If shops are a focus, then that activity is different from building more residential. Ken asked what reality do we tie infrastructure investment to? Jim offered that the focus could be on Main St and Church St frontages. Ken stated that the HPES reconstruction could have impacts on traffic. Tim asked if the new school highway access has been reviewed yet and Ron stated no. Lucy stated that encouraging families to locate in the village and creating a safe environment could be a goal. Jim asked about the recent connectivity scoping study's impact on the committee's work and Ron suggested that scoping studies help committees and boards focus on options that are possible, so the initial projects can be broken up into immediate, mid and long-term goals. Jim agreed having the information and scoping report is a good start, noting capital investment needs to be done in coordination with other investments, such as water, sewer, connectivity and sidewalks. Susan noted that the forthcoming stormwater master plan will be important to match up with water and sewer projects and new sidewalks. Jim stated that coordinated projects will help the village move forward. Tim asked about the stormwater issues and Ron stated

that the old rules of sending it directly to the Lamoille are over and municipalities are now required to make improvements that hold water, not send it. Ron advised that the stormwater master plan will be required to apply for stormwater implementation grants. Ron offered that until all of the planning work is done for the various village systems, it might be necessary to pave broken sidewalks and pave centerlines to temporarily improve the village streets, sidewalk system and stormwater flows. Ken noted that some systems are failing, so temporary repairs are likely to continue in the ground and on the surface. Jim stated that the Village needed good maps to ensure everything can be coordinated. Ken suggested that water lines need immediate attention. Susan stated that sidewalks should be considered after underground facilities are planned. Ken asked if Don Waterhouse could attend in November and Ron said he would ask him, noting that it would be good to have his perspective on the village streets. Tim asked about the benefit of coordinated design work and Ron stated that coordination will help ensure the best projects. Ken noted that he feels a business cycle recession is on the horizon which might spur the federal government to offer a new round of funds for infrastructure, most likely if they are shovel-ready. Ken asked how soon the coordinated plans could be done, as federal stimulus might occur in the next 2 years. Ron will prepare a list of state and federal grants and existing studies for review by the committee at the November meeting. Tim agreed that coordination should be done. Jim clarified that coordination included subsurface work, roadway improvements and sidewalks. Susan noted that sidewalk funds might be available through more than one grant program. Jim agreed that having the town and village work together was the best way. Lucy suggested that a more certain plan of action and timeline for the committee could be developed in November with an initial discussion on priorities after speaking with Don Waterhouse. Tim asked about Sylvan Road. Jim offered that the Selectboard is working on the list of roads that had ownership issues and they will decide whether or not to make roads official town highways. Ron noted that the other road in question is Crabapple Lane. Two roads, Mason Road and Hemingway Drive, are now in the highway acceptance process. Tim asked if addressing all the layers for each road is too much? Jim stated that the committee is trying to figure out priorities with all issues as efficiently as possible, then the Selectboard and Trustees will decide how to proceed. Ken stated that a critical path analysis benefits all involved. Ron offered that there are locations in the village that would have benefited from a cooperative approach. Ken noted that residential paths could also be added to connect sites and improve safety.

4. **Other Business** – None. Next Meeting: Monday, November 28th at 6:00 p.m. – Meet with Don Waterhouse; Discuss committee goals and timeframe to reach goals; Discuss project priorities
5. **Adjourn** – Motion by Ken to adjourn at 7:45 p.m. Seconded by Jim. So voted.

Submitted by Ron Rodjenski