

**Traffic Safety Advisory Committee**  
**May 18, 2009**  
**Minutes**

Present: Bill Ruoff – Chairman  
Chief Fred Douglas  
Dana MacAllister  
Gil Archambault  
Bill Parker  
Richard Tortorelli  
Dana MacAllister  
Dave Wheeler  
Gary Daniels, Board of Selectmen Representative

Kathryn Parenti, Recording Secretary

1. *Roll Call vote required by the BOS.*

**OLD BUSINESS:**

2. *Discussion: Clarification of ordinance regarding the area near 226 Whitten Road*

B. Ruoff began by stating G. Daniels had asked for clarification of the proposed ordinance for the above area.

G. Daniels had talked with F. Douglas regarding the speed limit and the posting of signs in the area. He stated he was under the impression that the speed limit signs would be installed on the existing curve signs but he felt the existing signs were much closer to the house than that. He asked if the intent was to move the curve signs as they are not three hundred (300) feet from the house in question which is what is stated in the ordinance.

F. Douglas replied the curve and speed signs would be co-mingled and would be installed three (300) hundred feet south and north of the above address, which is Dickie Whitten's old house. He agreed with G. Daniels that the existing signs are much closer than the three hundred (300) feet.

G. Daniels thought they were about eight (8) car lengths from the house and he didn't think the intent was to add two (2) additional posts to the area.

B. Ruoff thought the ordinance was speed limit signs co-mingled with the curve signs to be installed three hundred (300) feet on either side of the driveway.

F. Douglas agreed.

G. Daniels thought they could change the ordinance to be where the signs are installed now.

F. Douglas stated for the residents of the road, the signs should be a minimum of three hundred (300) feet from the driveway for a total of six hundred (600) feet between signs, if it is posted properly and if they expect the residents to abide by the speed limit. If they cut the distance down, it would be one hundred (100) or one hundred fifty (150) feet apart. He thought it would be best to measure, move and repost the signs.

B. Ruoff stated he was fine with that, as long as it goes along with the ordinance.

G. Daniels stated with regard to the ordinance that was proposed, it was tabled for clarification and only one (1) reading was done.

B. Ruoff stated he misunderstood the distance between the signs. The combination speed limit/curve ahead signs will give the best notification of the dangerous curve. These types of signs are all over the Catskills and the Albany area of New York.

G. Daniels stated he thought they were yellow signs.

B. Ruoff stated they are installed to instruct drivers to reduce their speed when coming into a curve.

G. Daniels asked F. Douglas if you are posting the speed on a sign, then it's not seen as a speed limit sign since official speed limit signs are white. He didn't think it was a problem, per se but it's not necessarily enforceable as a speed limit.

F. Douglas replied they should not have written an ordinance if this sign will be an advisory sign; black on yellow signs are advisory only.

G. Daniels replied that would take away his concerns with varying speed limits in the area.

F. Douglas noted the speed limit alterations are by state statute and they are not changing the speed limit; it is advisory, with the curve. He noted the speed limit sign can be twenty (20) miles per hour as an advisory sign but it's an enforceable speed limit.

G. Daniels stated the speed limit on the road would be twenty (20) miles an hour on the curve, twenty (20) miles an hour in the school zone when the lights are flashing and thirty (30) miles an hour otherwise; he had some concerns with the change in speed limit originally but those concerns have been addressed.

B. Parker asked where the committee was at with this issue.

B. Ruoff stated he had been ready to install the signs after the last meeting but this clarified things.

G. Daniels stated this would be fine with him.

B. Ruoff stated there was now a new motion on the table – the curve sign/speed limit combination sign that is yellow with black lettering and is considered to be an advisory-type speed limit. He felt this would be the best application as there is already a school zone speed limit on the road when the lights are flashing.

B. Parker stated the motion was so moved.

F. Douglas seconded the motion.

All were in favor; none opposed.

B. Parker asked if the signs would be installed three hundred (300) feet from the driveway in question.

F. Douglas stated there would not need to be an ordinance and the signs would be installed three hundred (300) feet in both directions of the driveway.

D. Wheeler thought the proposed signs would help the F. Douglas prosecute reckless drivers.

G. Archambault inquired about the time line of the installation of the signs.

B. Ruoff stated he would have to order the signs. He noted this was originally held up because of G. Daniel's concerns; they should be up before the next TSC meeting.

F. Douglas handed out some background information on the process involved in changing speed limits, for future reference, in case this comes up again.

B. Ruoff stated, based on today's approval, he will order the black and yellow advisory signs (20 mph and curve) tomorrow.

B. Ruoff thought the signs would be installed by then, depending on if the sign company is backed up or not and the reason for the hold up was the need to address G. Daniels' concerns.

G. Archambault asked if rocks had been placed in front of 226 Whitten Road yet.

D. Wheeler stated he had taken some large rocks from his son's house and placed them in the yard.

3. *Update: Reduction of speed in the urban compact area of Milford: possible ordinance drafting.*  
(Continued from March 30, 2009)

B. Parker and R. Tortorelli stated they have had some conversations about this subject. They have not found any information online and checked with Windham and Goffstown who have discussed this but have not acted upon it. He and R. Tortorelli thought it would be best to not move forward on this item and to post signs on all the roads leading into town stating the speed limit in Milford is thirty (30) mph unless otherwise posted.

R. Tortorelli stated Hollis has signs stating the speed limit is thirty five (35) mph unless otherwise posted but they were not able to find any information on any towns that have adopted the twenty five (25) mph speed limit.

F. Douglas felt the speed limit should be posted as thirty (30) miles per hour in the residential urban area and if you think about it, it's not posted as such. This solution is fine with him.

D. Wheeler inquired about the language and should the speed limit be tied to the urban area. He noted people travel at high rates of speed on Melendy and Osgood Roads and he noted the speed limit signs do get knocked down; perhaps they should be posted as well.

G. Daniels noted Merrimack had posted signs stating the town speed limit is 30 mph unless otherwise posted. He asked about the number of signs that would need to be put up.

B. Ruoff replied if the Committee feels the Town needs this, he would recommend the signs be installed on roads entering town. The type size would be larger than the "winter parking ban" signs. He thought there would be a total of six (6) signs.

G. Daniels asked if this has been a problem.

F. Douglas replied every four (4) or five (5) months someone comes before the Committee to change the speed limit on their street. When you add the cost of the sign plus the labor to put them up, it adds up to a lot of money. This would cover any specific areas of town that are not posted.

G. Daniels thought this issue has been addressed in the Granite Town Quarterly at least once. He thought the Town already had an ordinance addressing this. He felt it was more of an issue of how to educate people. He asked if they would be taking down all the thirty (30) mph signs in town.

F. Douglas stated he was not sure why they would want to take them down; they could if they wanted to.

B. Ruoff noted as the thirty (30) mph signs around town deteriorated, they would not have to be replaced.

There was some discussion on the speed limit of Route 13 South – in spots it was thirty (30) mph and toward Brookline it is fifty (50) mph.

B. Ruoff stated the signs would not be merely thirty (30) mph signs but would state: "Town of Milford, the speed limit is 30 mph unless otherwise posted".

F. Douglas noted in writing summonses, an ordinance would have to be passed for the summonses to be legal, if they give a summons to someone speeding on a road without a speed limit sign posted. The judge would have two concerns, the first being is the ordinance legal, and second, what is the area involved. He noted Mont Vernon has had much luck with their posted signs; they save the town headaches.

D. Wheeler thought they could follow the state thirty five (35) mph guidelines and asked if there were roads in town posted as such.

R. Tortorelli replied Osgood Road is posted as thirty (30) mph by the school and is thirty five (35) mph the rest of its length.

B. Parker thought this solution made sense.

G. Archambault recommended the installation of six (6) signs.  
B. Ruoff asked if the Committee recommended 1) an ordinance gets passed for a town-wide speed limit and 2) signs be posted at all the entrances into town.  
G. Daniels thought that would be unnecessary if the Town already has an ordinance stating the town-wide speed limit is 30 mph.  
F. Douglas replied he had never seen one.  
B. Parker recommended signs be installed on Mason Road.  
F. Douglas concurred as it is heavily travelled from Wilton.  
B. Ruoff thought McGettigan Road should have a sign as well as people use it to travel from Wilton to Savage Road.  
G. Archambault asked if the speed limits are established, why an ordinance is needed to back it up.  
B. Ruoff replied there are many roads in town that do not have posted speed limit signs and with a town-wide speed limit and it would help to not have to continually post the speed limit.  
G. Daniels asked if there had been many postings to lower the speed to thirty (30) mph. He wasn't sure how this would take away the need for people to ask for a reduction in speed since people are probably going to come in to ask that the speed be reduced to less than 30 mph.  
D. Wheeler stated he wasn't sure about McGettigan Road but he would assume the speed limit is thirty five (35) mph under the state speed limit. The posted speed limit of thirty (30) mph would effectively drop the unposted speeds to thirty (30), unless otherwise posted on rural roads.  
F. Douglas noted that any new developments accepted by the town would have a speed limit of thirty (30) mph and would not need to be posted.  
D. Wheeler noted it was difficult to distinguish between the residential and the urban area.  
F. Douglas replied residential areas have more houses. Going back to the basic speed limit law, if the speed limit is posted thirty (30) mph and you're traveling at thirty five (35) mph, you won't get a summons because the courts won't accept it. The police department won't issue summonses unless the driver is going fifteen (15) mph or above the speed limit, unless the existing conditions warrant a summons. He noted people travel on Route 13S at forty two (42) to forty five (45) mph.  
B. Parker recommended they post, at all the entrances into town, signs that say the speed limit is thirty (30) mph unless otherwise posted.  
G. Archambault suggested the signs state "Welcome to Milford, the speed limit is thirty (30) mph unless otherwise posted".  
B. Parker moved to install signs at the entrances of town stating the speed limit is thirty (30) mph.  
R. Tortorelli seconded the motion.  
All were in favor; none were opposed.  
F. Douglas stated he would draft the language for the Board of Selectmen to vote on. He was certain there was not an ordinance already on the books. He stated he would get it on the agenda for the next BOS meeting.  
There was some discussion on whether the "Welcome to Milford" part of the sign would be good to add; the wording would be determined at another time.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

4. *Discussion of signage for horse crossing*
5. *Discussion of signage for children playing in road.*

B. Ruoff stated he has worked for the Town for nine (9) years and has, on occasion, received requests for signs for horses. With regard to 5, he noted the State of NH frowns on signs that state children are playing in the road, which implies they are allowed to play in the road. He stated he wanted the TSC to be in agreement that this is not the right thing to do.

G. Archambault agreed. He noted there is a horse farm on Savage Road and people are out riding them on the road quite frequently. He felt a caution sign indicating horses were ahead would be necessary to warn drivers before they happen upon the horses.

B. Parker agreed. He also noted there are several signs around Town stating children are at play and for drivers to go slow.

B. Ruoff stated the DOT says signs that state "Slow, Children" are discriminatory and imply the children are handicapped.

G. Daniels thought signs telling drivers to be prepared to stop, basketball game in progress would be good as well.

F. Douglas replied basketball hoops in the roads are a problem in town.

B. Ruoff stated his plow truck drivers go around to all the homes with basketball hoops by the road and tell the owners to move them before the first snow or they'll be plowed over. He thought a "Horses - Caution" sign would be appropriate. He stated he would call the sign company and ask what other towns use. He stated he would not use "horse crossing" as that indicates the horse will be crossing in that area when they may not be. There was some discussion on if the "Children at Play" signs were necessary and where they should be put up.

F. Douglas proposed if it's that important to the parents, they buy the sign through Public Works.

B. Ruoff asked if there was a motion.

G. Archambault made the motion for parents to buy the signs from Public Works if they feel it is necessary for their street.

R. Tortorelli seconded the motion.

G. Daniels asked if the price of the sign would include the cost of labor.

B. Ruoff stated it would probably cost between \$125 and \$150. They'd have to work on the wording of the sign; "Caution Children" perhaps.

G. Daniels noted the motion for the signs - people requesting signs pay for the sign and the labor - was still on the table.

B. Parker noted it was already moved and seconded to have each individual party requesting a caution children sign pay for the total cost of installation.

All were in favor; none were opposed.

R. Tortorelli asked when the markings on the roads would be repainted as they are difficult to see.

B. Ruoff replied they have started the repainting and noted most of what they had painted last year is gone. The paint crew is ready to go and is working on the downtown area to be ready for Memorial Day and will be working at night.

D. Wheeler asked about the confusing signage at 101 and 101A near Wilton.

F. Douglas replied engineers had worked on that intersection and that was what they had come up with. He had called Concord to see if it could be made less confusing but nothing can be done. He noted if you're not looking where you're going, nothing gives you any indication of where you need to go.

B. Ruoff noted the state had asked for recommendation and then ignored them.

G. Archambault noted the “use directional signals” sign on Savage Road is currently too small due to the new owners of the property the sign is on are not trimming the bush in front of the sign so it is partially obscured.

B. Ruoff stated he would look at it and if the sign is installed in the right of way, the town can trim the bushes covering the sign.

G. Archambault asked if the Meadowbrook development was a private or public road as there is no stop sign or stop bar at the corner of Meadowbrook and Whitten Road and people just pull out without stopping.

F. Douglas noted it was not the Town’s responsibility but it might be a requirement on the original development plan.

B. Parker said he would double check that but if it’s not on the plan, what should they do about it.

B. Ruoff stated the Town could tell them to install one.

F. Douglas replied statutory language says private roads yield the right of way to oncoming traffic; those drivers can’t impede the flow of traffic. If there is an accident at that intersection and you are not at fault, the other person would be.

#### MINUTES:

6. *Approval of minutes from March 30, 2009.*

B. Ruoff asked if there were any comments or questions with regard to the minutes; there were none so he asked for a motion to approve.

R. Tortorelli made the motion to approve the minutes as written.

G. Archambault seconded the motion.

All were in favor; none opposed.