

- 1. Eric Dyer, Readfield town manager provided opening remarks. He discussed the purpose of the meeting, provided information on past meetings, discussed activities of the consultant and provided a history of the project.
- 2. Travis Landry, Gorrill Palmer project manager provided a technical presentation on the concept plans. He explained how the plans have changed since the last meeting and summarized comments received at the first public meeting.
- 3. Travis Landry proceeded to describe the latest sidewalk design that has been developed through input from the public, town officials and DOT.
 - a. The new sidewalk is proposed on the western (meeting house) side of Church Road from Main Street to the Morrow/Gray property driveway.
 - b. A raised crosswalk is proposed with rectangular rapid flashing beacons at the Morrow/Gray property driveway.
 - c. The sidewalk then continues on the eastern side of the roadway up to the fairgrounds.
 - d. On street parking is proposed throughout the project with curb extensions in areas where utility poles, driveways, and mailboxes are present.
 - e. Installation of concrete slipform curb and minor improvements to the roadway shoulder are proposed.
 - f. Drainage improvements will consist of underdrain and catch basins where we are proposing curbing and sidewalks. Outlet locations will match the existing outlet locations.
- 4. The following written comments were received on the latest plans prior to the public meeting.
 - a. Comment: Concerns with the existing ditch and possibly extending closed drainage system.

Response: The existing ditch is proposed to be filled within the limits of the proposed sidewalk.

b. Comment: Use of raised crosswalks and design for vehicle clearance.

Response: Raised crosswalks and speed humps have been proposed and will be designed to DOT standards.

c. Comment: RRFB's continuous operation or user activated.

Response: User activated, only flash when buttons are pushed.

d. Comment: Use of bump outs at driveway locations.

Response: Bump outs (curb extensions) are proposed to provide traffic calming, delineate on street parking locations, provide additional space for utility poles and to provide locations for mailboxes.

e. Comment: Reducing the roadway width to 9 feet



Response: This width is not permitted with current roadway design standards. Currently, the design calls for 11' travel lanes and 2' shoulders, in areas of on street parking we have 11' travel lanes and 8' shoulders/parking stalls.

f. Comment: Adding an additional crosswalk at the speed hump located in front of the Union Meeting House.

Response: With the current design only providing sidewalk on one side of the road, we cannot propose a crosswalk at this location as the crosswalk would not lead to another sidewalk.

g. Comment: Street Lighting.

Response: Street lighting will be reviewed once the layout for the sidewalk has been determined. Lighting at crosswalks will be considered and proposed.

h. Comment: Basement drains/foundation drains.

Response: Foundation drains have been noted in the survey information and we are aware of them. Connections of known foundation drains to the proposed drainage system will be included in the design.

i. Comment: Interim improvements to the shoulder material near the fairgrounds

Response: The town will give this comment consideration separate from this project.

- 5. In terms of next steps, these concept plans will be finalized, and we will proceed towards a 50% design submittal, also known as the preliminary design report (PDR) submittal. A formal public meeting will occur after the draft PDR package is submitted.
- 6. The following is a summary of the comments and questions received at this meeting:
 - a. Comment: Water District concerned with drainage structure locations over water main.

Response: Proposed catch basin locations will aim to avoid or minimize conflicts with the existing water main, when possible. A 5' minimum separation was noted by the water district representative. Granite curbing was also preferred by the water district due to its ability to be removed and reset if needed.

b. Question: What will be done about the existing ditch along the roadway and its safety concerns?

Response: In areas where sidewalks are proposed, the ditch will be filled in and closed drainage will be installed. Beyond the limits of the proposed sidewalks, no alterations to the existing ditch are currently proposed. The town has agreed to review ditch areas beyond the limits of proposed sidewalks.

c. Question: How will open drainage in the existing ditch get into the closed drainage system and how will clogging be prevented?



Response: A drainage inlet will be proposed within the existing ditch to allow drainage to enter the closed drainage system. The type of this inlet is to be determined but could consist of an open pipe inlet or a drainage structure. The inlet could also have a grate/cover to prevent debris from entering the closed drainage system.

d. Question: Is there any drainage work being completed on the east side of the project closer to the Main Street intersection? Resident at 15 Church Road noted that there is roadway drainage that flows onto his property and deposits sand and other sediment in the lawn area.

Response: No drainage work is planned in this area. The consultant agreed to review the existing drainage in this area to see if low-cost drainage improvements could be considered for this area.

e. Comment: Church Road is used by children biking to the fairgrounds. Concerns with vehicle speeds and safety of children were noted.

Response: Traffic calming measures are being proposed for this project to help slow traffic down.

f. Comment: An older drainage project completed by the town to improve ditching seems to have undermined an existing leach field.

Response: The town to investigate this matter separate from this project.

g. Question: What is the drainage design year?

Response: The design year and design methodology will follow the MaineDOT standards for drainage design. Conservative drainage sizing will be used to the maximum extent practicable.

h. Comment: Speeds are very high in this area, making walking unsafe.

Response: Traffic calming measures are being proposed for this project to help slow traffic down. The current design proposes two speed tables and a third speed table has been requested from this meeting, to be located near the Fairgrounds.

i. Comment: A third speed hump is needed up near the fairgrounds.

Response: A third speed hump will be considered in the design.

j. Comment: The proposed on-street parking of 20 spaces is great.

Response: Thank you for this positive feedback.

k. Comment: A resident mentioned that a parabolic speed table may be better than a flat top speed table.

Response: The design team will investigate this comment.

READFIELD CHURCH ROAD SIDEWALK WIN 25113.00 PUBLIC MEETING #2, MEETING MINUTES OCTOBER 02, 2023, 6:30PM



I. Question: How will foundation drains be addressed?

Response: Foundation drains will be tied into the proposed closed drainage system as needed in accordance with the Maine DOT standard details and specifications. Property owner reports will be reviewed, and a survey of attendees with foundation drains was collected during this public meeting, which is recorded. Foundation drains will be identified on the plans for the next public meeting.

m. Question: What is the project schedule?

Response: The next public meeting will be held in early 2024. The town will vote in June 2024 to determine whether to fund the construction phase of this project. If funded, the construction of this project could occur in 2025.

n. Question: What is the advisory travel speed over the speed tables?

Response: The advisory speed for a speed table/raised crosswalk is 15 MPH. Advanced signage for the crosswalk and speed tables is planned.

o. Comment: The existing trees and the stone wall in front of the Fairgrounds should be saved if possible.

Response: This design of this area will be reviewed again, to see if trees and the stone wall can be saved.

p. Comment: Walking near the Fairgrounds could be improved temporarily by adding gravel in the shoulder.

Response: The town will investigate this matter separate from this project.

q. Comment: Concerns regarding curb bump outs and winter maintenance (plowing).

Response: Curb extensions are common and do not typically present a major concern with winter maintenance.

7. End.