

APPENDIX C  
**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT NOTES**



**Public Work Session #1  
January 4, 2017**

*MEETING NOTES*

Attendees:

Steve Lotspeich opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m., and outlined that the purpose of the meeting was introduce the townspeople to the project, a study for a possible future sidewalk from the Crossroad – Laurel Lane intersection with Route 100 to the Blush Hill Road – Stowe Street intersection with Route 100. He also briefly described that this was an extension of the previously completed Colbyville Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Attendees gave a brief introduction as to who they were, and what connection they had to the project.

Jim Donovan then began a general overview of the project, starting with the purpose and need statement i.e. including the creation of a safer route for pedestrians to travel from the historic Colbyville district, through the project area to the businesses and nearby residences and a safer walking route to the schools and the list of various reason why the project is needed.

The floor was then opened up for questions and comments from the public on the purpose and need.

- This area is a pinch point for several of the roadway corridors heading north and south.
- The sidewalk would improve the economic activity in the area.
- Route 100 is not a safe place to walk now.

Jim then gave an overview of the existing conditions in the project area and again opened the work session for public comment and discussion.

- Is the VTtrans Route 100 paving project going to move the existing guardrails? (Barb Farr answered no, that they will be replaced with box beam rails, but in the same location.)
- Will the paving project include enough room for bicycle lanes and a sidewalk? (No, the paving project will be including 11' wide vehicular travel lanes and 5' wide bike lanes and some new crosswalks, but no sidewalks.)
- Some people mentioned that they don't like the idea of a sidewalk along the east side of the road north of Mill Street.
- With the increase in traffic over the years, will there be any new signals, including pedestrian activated ones, along Route 100 in Colbyville? (Barb indicated that the new paving plans for Route 100 did not include any new traffic signals.)
- How will pedestrians get from the Route 100 corridor to the park and ride?
- Crossing Route 100 is very important.

- Is there a way to connect the park and ride to Shaw's? (To both of these questions, Jim described the sidewalks included in the Colbyville Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.)
- The community path is within a Town owned four rod right-of-way, could that be used as a route? (Jim mentioned that the Project Study Areas was expanded from just Route 100 so that the Community Path and possibly other routes not directly within the Route 100 right-of-way could be considered.)
- Can a pedestrian signal be installed at the bottom of Blush Hill Road to serve the hotel and residences further up the road? (Jim said that it would most likely be one of the alternatives considered during the project.)
- Some mentioned that they didn't care about the pedestrians from either hotel, and that the community path would be the best choice for the residences north of the project area.
- Education should be part of the recommendation, to make sure people understand where the sidewalks go.
- We should consider a bridge over Route 100 for pedestrians and bicyclists since it is so difficult to cross the road.
- Putting a sidewalk along Route 100 is not the right priority for the Town.
- The sidewalk should be on the east side of the road with a crosswalk at Laurel Lane.
- Will snow plowing and other maintenance costs be part of the budget. (Jim replied that the final report would include an initial estimate of probable construction costs, as well as additional information on the potential costs and issues associated with maintaining the sidewalk.
- The maintenance of the community path is currently done by volunteers.
- Will the guardrails remain in their current location? (Doug indicated that the existing guardrails would be replaced with box beam rails located in the same location as the existing guardrails.
- We should consider pedestrian refuge islands on Route 100 at the pedestrian crossing areas.
- If possible, the project should include a traffic signal at the intersection of Route 100 and Laurel Lane.
- The Town should assume control of Route 100 in Colbyville.
- Will there be special recommendations for Colbyville Historic District? (Jim noted that the sidewalks should be compatible with the Historic District; the specific impacts that the various sidewalk alternatives might have on the District would be noted in the alternatives discussion.)

Jim noted that the next public work session was tentatively scheduled for March 9, 2017. The public would be able to review the different alternatives at that meeting and help select the most appropriate ones. The Town would send out notices before the meeting.

**Public Work Session #2  
March 9, 2017**

*MEETING NOTES*

Attendees:

Steve Lotspeich opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m., and outlined that the purpose of the meeting was introduce the townspeople to the project, a study for a possible future sidewalk from the Crossroad – Laurel Lane intersection with Route 100 to the Blush Hill Road – Stowe Street intersection.

All attendees gave a brief introduction as to who they were, and what connection they had to the project.

Jim Donovan then began a general overview of the project, and explained that the purpose of this meeting was to try to get a consensus from the attendees as to their preferences for the sidewalk alignment. Jim explained that for ease of discussion, the maps and the report have divided the route into three sections, A (south), B (central), and C (north).

Jim explained in the South Sections, Alternative A-1, the red line on the figure, would be a five-foot wide concrete sidewalk behind the guardrail. Due to the steep slopes down to Thatcher Brook behind the guardrail, the sidewalk would need to be supported by a short retaining wall, constructed out of precast concrete blocks. The height of the wall would also require the addition of a railing along the top of it as well. The sidewalk would proceed from the northeast corner of the Stowe Street / Route 100 intersection to the Mobil station driveway cross the driveway, and then cut through the middle of the landscaped island in front of the Mobil station, ending at a crosswalk across the Shaw's driveway. It would be totally located within the Route 100 right-of-way.

Alternative A-2, the blue line on the figure, would also be a five-foot wide concrete sidewalk. It would start near the northwest corner of the Stowe Street / Route 100 intersection and proceed across the Exxon station driveway to a point opposite the Shaw's driveway. It would be placed behind the existing swale along the road to allow for separation between it and the roadway, which would place it outside of the Route 100 right-of-way.

After describing the alternatives for section A, Jim asked if anyone had any comments or preferences for this section. People questioned the available right-of-way. Jim explained that the Route 100 right-of-way was quite wide and variable along the east side, and that no right-of way acquisition would be required for Alternative A-1, but that along the west side the right-of-way is very narrow, and that therefore the Town would need to acquire rights from the Exxon station for Alternative A-2. Several attendees seemed to believe that the owner of that property may be difficult to deal with, and that once you got north of the Exxon station, there were no more destinations along that side, at least in Section A. After questioning the relative costs of the two options, and several minutes of general discussion, a general agreement was arrived at that the

preference for that section was to move forward Alternative A-1 on the east side of Route 100, as well as Alternative A-2 to the Exxon parking lot. They also realized that when Blush Hill Meadow, the development being constructed on top on the hill across from Shaw's gets built out, the developer is required to build a pedestrian connection to Route 100.

Jim then presented the alternatives for Section B. Alternative B-1, a green line on the figures, would be a five foot sidewalk located behind the guardrail, basically the same as Alternative A-1. Jim explained that Alternative B-1 would be a five foot wide concrete sidewalk behind the guardrail. Due to the steep slopes down to the wetland behind the guardrail, the sidewalk would need to be supported by a short retaining wall, constructed out of precast concrete blocks. The wall would also require the addition of a railing along the top of it as well. The sidewalk would proceed from the northeast corner of the Shaw's drive / Route 100 intersection crossing the drives of the hardware store and carwash, ending at a crosswalk across Mill Street. This Alignment would also require that the planters in front of the hardware store and car wash may need to be moved / reconstructed.

Alternative B-2, the light brown line on the figure, would make a loop through the Shaw's property using the existing sidewalk along the entrance driveway and building a new sidewalk along the northern entry and along Mill Road back to Route 100. It would also be a five foot wide concrete sidewalk,

After describing the alternatives for the central section, Jim again asked for preferences or comments from the attendees for Section B. People again questioned the available right-of-way. Jim explained that the Route 100 right-of-way continued to be quite wide and variable along the east side, and that no right-of way acquisition would be required for Alternative B-1, but that Alternative B-2 would be almost entirely on private property, thereby requiring easements from both Shaw's and Merchants Bank at the intersection of Mill Road and Route 100. It was noted that the route down through the Shaw's property is the one shown on a sidewalk master plan map prepared several years ago, and that the study was funded by Shaw's, thereby implying agreement with that route. After extended discussion about the circuitry of the route, there seemed to be general agreement that the preference for that section was to move forward on Alternative B-1, directly along Route 100, to the Mill Road intersection.

Jim then presented two alternatives for Section C. He explained that Alternative C-1, the yellow line on the figure, would be a five-foot wide concrete sidewalk separated from the Route 100 pavement by a four to five foot wide grass strip. The reason for the variance in width of the grass is due to the slopes leading up from the edge of the road, and attempts to stay within the road right-of-way. The right-of-way gets substantially narrower through this section. The sidewalk would proceed from the northeast corner of the Mill Road / Route 100 intersection to the Hong Kong Restaurant parking lot. Because the parking area west of the building is almost entirely within the road right-of-way, this project would complete some access management by construction of a wide curbed nosing with the sidewalk within it, leading to a new crosswalk across Route 100. The nosing would be needed to protect pedestrians from patrons of the restaurant using the sidewalk as more parking. The crosswalk would be in a very poor location, as the sight distances both ways would be substandard. Special electronic warning signs would be needed for the crosswalk.

Alternative C-2, the purple line on the figure, would begin with a crosswalk across Route 100 at the south side of Mill Road, and then proceed as a five foot wide concrete sidewalk between the storm water management facilities of the Fairfield Inn and the Route 100 pavement. Due to the

narrowness of the road right-of-way here, the sidewalk would be placed directly behind a new concrete curb along the edge of the Route 100 pavement. The section would end at the south end of the existing Fairfield Inn sidewalk, which is on private property.

After describing the alternatives for Section C, Jim asked if there were comments or preferences for these alternatives. People questioned the ability of the project to re-configure the restaurant's parking lot, but Jim reminded people that the parking was almost all in the right-of-way, and that it was fair game. Everyone agreed that the crosswalk at the restaurant would not be a good idea. Someone asked if Alternative C-1 could be extended only as far as the Colby Mansion, but that idea was quickly discarded as pedestrian would be stranded there with no safe way to continue north, and it was felt that it was unlikely that people would walk back down to Mill Street, but instead just try to cross at the end of the sidewalk in front of Colby Mansion without the benefit of any crosswalk protection. After extended discussion about the need to work around the Fairfield stormwater facilities, there was general agreement that the preference for that section was to move forward on Alternative C-2 on the west side of Route 100, with the crosswalk located at Mill Road. They suggested that the sidewalk should be moved away from the edge of the road if possible, even if it meant placing part or all of it outside of the Route 100 right-of-way.

Jim summarized the preferences:

- Alternative A-1,
- Alternative B-1, and
- Alternative C-2.

The attendees also endorsed the continued recommendation of improvements to the Community Path and the construction of the sidewalks on the other Town streets, especially the extension of the Stowe Street sidewalk to Route 100 and the addition of a crosswalk on Route 100 at the Stowe Street Blush Hill Road intersection.

The meeting ended about 9:30 PM.

**BROADREACH**  
Planning & Design



Heritage Landscapes LLC

**UVM**  
**CAP**