

Topic	Stakeholder Comment	MaineDOT Response
Bike and Pedestrian Accomodations, Traffic	I'm always concerned/angry about the excessive speed on Elm Street and all the noise made by "souped-up" mufflers vehicles. I hope a traffic light will help slow down the traffic.	<i>No Response Requested</i>
Daily Commute	This is the dumbest thing I have ever seen.	<i>No Response Requested</i>
None Provided	I approve and support the MaineDOT's U.S. 201 intersection improvements Project. The aspect that I love about MaineDOT's U.S. 201 intersection improvements Project is that a traffic signal will be installed which will reduce angle crashes.	<i>No Response Requested</i>
Traffic	<p>Thank for the opportunity to give input. I am a Skowhegan resident and have lived here some 23 yrs. I am also an engineer. I have several concerns as I think the current solution is just going to relocate the problems, to some degree. 1. The highest volume of traffic is US201 southbound. Limiting through traffic from 201N to one lane is going to back up traffic far up the hill. People will try to merge into this single through lane all the way down the hill and will result in an elevated number of merge accidents in this area. This is already occurring. Right turning traffic also backs up the proposed single through traffic lane at this location making it difficult for south bound traffic. A dedicated right turn lane would help. The southbound volume will be the biggest problem. Should study how far this is going to back people up the hill, including a large number of loaded logging trucks headed for Sappi. This steep hill is an unsafe place to keep those trucks waiting. This could lead to some tragic events. Hope these comments are helpful! 2. The changes will make it easier for Commercial st traffic. 3. Should consider shutting off the entrance to and from Elm Street altogether, or limiting it to right turns only off Madison Ave, the bank won't like that. 4. Ideally if the buildings on the West side of US201 between Commercial St and US 2 were raised there could be improved alignment with the bridges and a wider entrance onto the north bridge, improving truck/car safety. This would be expensive, but have a great result. This would enable 2 way traffic onto Madison Ave to and from US 2 without turning onto Main and Commercial Streets. This would all but eliminate the safety problems for drivers negotiating the u turn from Main onto Commercial and merging with the US 2 traffic.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments. We will provide responses to each of your points below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed change of lane uses at the intersection of Route 201 at High Street and Pleasant Street was requested by the MaineDOT Bureau of Planning based on their modeling of traffic operations in the area. The model indicates that average southbound queuing in peak hour traffic will extend about half the distance between the signalized intersection at High and Pleasant Streets and the unsignalized intersection at Leavitt Street to the north. The 95th percentile queue length in the model indicates that the queue could occasionally extend up to the Leavitt Street intersection. While the grade on Route 201 in the vicinity of and north of Leavitt Street is about 5%, the queuing generally will occur on the much more moderate 2% grade approaching the traffic signal. Signing will be installed to give advance warning to southbound traffic of appropriate lane uses at the signal and to encourage an orderly merge on that approach. That signing includes overhead lane use signing on span-wire over the roadway approximately 200' north of the intersection, as well as roadside advance lane use signage approximately 500' in advance of the intersection. You are correct that a southbound dedicated right turn lane could be helpful. Southbound right-turning traffic is about 13% of the total peak hour volume on that intersection approach and does meet volume warrants for consideration of construction of a dedicated right turn lane. However, that work exceeds the scope and funding of this project and traffic modeling indicates the current design should provide acceptable levels of service. Signalization of the Madison Ave./Commercial intersection was determined by the Department to be the best means to improve safety there. Because of its proximity to the existing Route 201 signal at High and Pleasant Streets, the two traffic signals will be interconnected to coordinate traffic flow. The limited improvements at the Madison/High/Pleasant intersection in this project are intended only to facilitate that interconnection. 2. We agree that the changes proposed for the Madison/Elm/Commercial intersection should improve Commercial Street traffic operations. 3. Further restriction of access to Elm Street at the proposed new traffic signal was considered and discussed between MaineDOT and municipal officials. It was determined that the most acceptable option locally would be to eliminate left turns from Elm Street, as is currently proposed. The left turn traffic volume from Elm Street is very low. Additional restrictions could be implemented in the future for Elm Street, if determined later to be necessary, but they would require local approval since Elm Street is a local road. 4. We agree that, in an ideal world, realignment of Madison Avenue to shift it to the west to better align with the north bridge would be desirable. However, razing all of the buildings in that area for that purpose is far beyond the funded intersection safety improvement scope of this project at the Madison/Elm/Commercial intersection. It should be noted also that those buildings adjoin or are part of the downtown Skowhegan historic district and would have a high bar to get over to meet federal permitting requirements for removal.

Topic	Stakeholder Comment	MaineDOT Response
Traffic	<p>Skowhegan Savings as a whole have a major concern that the proposed Elm Street approach to the intersection will be converted to "right turn only". This creates an undue hindrance to our customers accessing Madison avenue northbound and will contribute to additional traffic through our driveway and parking areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for sharing your concern. The town has asked that we look at this further also, which we are doing. However, the purpose of the "right turn only" is to prevent accidents and may outweigh the added inconvenience of having to drive around the block, an additional 1230 feet or 0.23 miles. We will be reviewing this before we move the project to final design and either way this goes, nothing being proposed would prevent this movement from being changed in the future should the need or desire be there to do so.</p>
	<p>Hi Aurele, The Bank has a driveway access from our Main Branch upper parking lot to our lower parking lot with access to Pleasant Street. Most of our bank and ATM customers along with Library patrons and the local Elm St. residents know of and use this access to avoid the pain of trying to make a left turn onto Madison Ave from Elm Street. This is probably the reason your traffic study showed low number of cars making a left turn from Elm to Madison. That being said the bank would like to reduce or at least avoid increase of through traffic in our driveway and parking areas as it raises our risk and liability of pedestrian and vehicle accidents on our property. There is currently a good amount of pedestrian foot traffic through our driveway areas from bank customers as well as library patrons. The library is also in the process of installing a book drop box in our driveway that will further increase traffic flow through our premises. I believe most people find it counter-intuitive to make a right turn and go south when they really want to go left and north to reach their destination. I would think a red light to hold the right turning Commercial St. traffic briefly would result in negligible traffic back up. The left turn option would also reduce the amount of vehicles driving around the block for no real reason. I would love the opportunity to discuss this further with you in person or by phone when we can reference google maps so you can get a better picture of our situation.</p>	<p>Thank you for the additional details. You have some good points and I will share these with the project team. As noted before we are looking at this again at the town's request and will take your comments into consideration as well. I will give you a call if we have any questions but I believe we have a clear understanding of the situation from your message. We were aware of the drive-through but not of the additional use of it, which we obviously cannot regulate but as you note, we don't want to add to it either.</p>