

Bonenfant, Janice

From: Jim Schlosser <jim4concord@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 3:24 PM
To: Bonenfant, Janice
Cc: kmisprint@gmail.com; DON BRUEGGEMANN
Subject: Fwd: Urgent attention: unresolved problems with traffic study
Attachments: Rundlett_Final_Comment_Letter.pdf

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Janice: Would you please add this email and attachment to the previous Don Brueggemann email for the July City Council Agenda for referral to the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee?

Thanks so much.
Warm regards,
Jim

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Karina Mitchell <kmisprint@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jun 21, 2026 at 9:02 PM
Subject: Urgent attention: unresolved problems with traffic study
To: <Nicole.fox@fando.com>, Hill,Karen <KHill@concordnh.gov>, Matt Cashman <mcashman@sau8.org>, jim4concord@gmail.com <jim4concord@gmail.com>, Linda Zollo <l.zollo@comcast.net>, donbruegge@comcast.net <donbruegge@comcast.net>

Dear Concord Leaders and Planners,

Thank you for your service and leadership.

Please accept my letter sent to the Concord School Board regarding the many inconsistencies, unresolved issues and contradictions found in the traffic study for the middle school. Nothing in the attached letter is an opinion, judgement or speculation: the letter strictly cites the problems that the traffic study brings up.

The city and the taxpaying residents deserve answers to these important questions that the experts have failed to resolve.

Please respond with answers to the important questions this letter raises. I am seeking your help because there was no response when it was sent to the Concord School Board.

The letter outlines very specific questions that demand answers and clarification before proceeding further with final traffic plans.

From here, it will be sent as a letter to the editor and several southern NH newspapers and media outlets for a story and publicity about this process and the lack of transparency and responsibility to the community.

Thank you for your attention to the facts outlined and your help getting written answers to the important questions raised. If there is more information by way of published traffic studies that are not taken into consideration in these facts please direct me to the documentation.

Also, let me know who the media contact is responding to media inquiries on behalf of the Concord school board and the city of concord.

Respectfully,

Karina Mitchell Bargiel
37 Noyes Street
Concord NH

LETTER SENT VIA SCHOOL BOARD WEBSITE JUNE 8th, 2026 NO RESPONSE

Mr and Mrs Albert Bargiel
Karina Mitchell Bargiel
37 Noyes Street, Concord, NH 03301
June 8, 2026

Concord School Board
City of Concord, New Hampshire

RE: Rundlett Middle School Renovation — Traffic Impact Study: Specific Errors, Omissions, and Internal Contradictions (GPI Ref. NEX-2500336.00, Updated May 18, 2026)

Dear Members of the Concord School Board,

It's been cited that the engineers, the experts, have reviewed the traffic plans and the current options are the best options. But there are factual gaps and contradictions within the traffic impact document submitted for approval. The traffic plan should be halted until the following issues have clear answers. A vote to halt the traffic plan as it relates to the overall design is an urgent need. There are too many issues that are unresolved.

Let's review what the engineers have understated.

WHAT THE STUDY ACCOUNTS FOR vs. WHAT IS MISSING

1. Bus Loop Capacity — Internal Contradiction (Study p. 60)

Accounted for: The study states the bus loop holds 10 buses. The proposed fleet is 19 buses.

Missing: A plan for the remaining 9 buses. In the Alternatives Analysis section, the study rejects a competing design with this language (p. 60):

"Only 10 buses will be able to fit within the bus loop, so the additional nine buses will back onto Cornell Street and Noyes Street in the afternoon, blocking neighborhood traffic and egress from the staff parking lot."

The preferred plan uses the identical bus loop. The study applies this overflow argument to kill an alternative but never resolves the same problem in the plan it recommends. Where do the 9 overflow buses go?

2. Service Drive — Assigned Three Incompatible Uses (Study pp. 6, 48, 60)

Accounted for: Three separate sections of the study assign three different functions to the same gated lane:

"This drive aisle will be gated and restricted to service and emergency vehicles only." (p. 6)

"Additional bus storage is available along the service drive to accommodate future enrollment increases." (p. 48)

The service area is also identified as a source of conflict with delivery vehicles, requiring "careful scheduling." (p. 60)

Missing: Any explanation of how a single gated lane simultaneously handles overflow buses, accessible/special education vehicles, service vehicle access, and emergency vehicle access. The study states all three assignments as benefits or design features without acknowledging the conflict between them.

3. Vehicle Count — 20 Observed, 19 Modeled (Study p. 16 vs. p. 26)

Accounted for: Page 16 documents what was actually observed:

"A total of three Type A buses, one accessible van, one Boys & Girls Club Bus, and 15 standard school buses were observed dropping off and picking up students at the Rundlett Middle School."

That is 20 vehicles. Page 26 then states:

"Currently, there are 19 buses that utilize the existing... driveway on South Street to access the bus loop."

Missing: The Boys & Girls Club bus.. It is documented in the observations and absent from the proposed model. No queue location, staging plan, departure time, or conflict analysis is provided for it anywhere in the study.

4. Accessible Van and Type A Buses — Observed Blocking Not Resolved (Study p. 14)

Accounted for: Page 14 documents a specific blocking event observed under existing conditions:

"When all spaces within the westerly lot were occupied, parents began forming a queue within the lot, which blocked egress for the accessible van and Type A bus that utilized this parking lot for loading students with mobility impairments."

Missing: Any resolution of this conflict under the proposed plan. The proposed design routes the same accessible and special education vehicles through the same service drive now also assigned to overflow buses and deliveries. The observed problem is documented and then ignored.

5. After-School Athletic, Field Trip, Music, and Activity Buses — Entirely Absent

Accounted for: Nothing. The study models only standard morning arrival and afternoon dismissal. It contains no reference to athletic team buses, activity or field trip buses, music program transportation, or any other vehicle that does not follow the 3:30 PM dismissal bell.

Missing: Staging locations, departure windows, and conflict analysis for all after-school transportation. The Boys & Girls Club bus, documented in the study at 3:42 PM, already departs after the main dismissal wave begins. No analysis addresses how late-departing program vehicles interact with the lingering parent pickup queue.

6. Municipal Service Vehicles — Not Modeled

Accounted for: Nothing. The words garbage, trash, waste, plow, snow, and delivery do not appear in the traffic analysis. The only reference to service vehicles is the single sentence on p. 6 designating the service drive as their exclusive access route.

Missing: Access routes, scheduling, and conflict analysis for:

- Municipal solid waste collection (large rear- or front-load trucks on fixed weekly schedules)
- Snow plow operations, which must clear the bus loop, parking lots, and adjacent streets simultaneously
- Food service and supply deliveries for a 900-student cafeteria
- Emergency vehicle access through a corridor carrying up to 19 queued buses during two daily windows

The vehicle turning path analysis (p. 36) confirms the City's ladder truck was modeled for geometry. That analysis covers only whether the truck can make the turn — not whether it can actually access the school when the service drive is occupied by buses or other vehicles.

7. The Study Admits Buses Exiting Noyes Street May Need a Traffic Control Officer — Then Says No Additional Measures Are Needed (Study pp. 49 and 5)

Page 49 states:

“During the afternoon dismissal, buses are anticipated to exit the school in two platoons of 9 to 10 buses. This may be facilitated by a traffic control officer to stop traffic on South Street, should issues arise with buses making this left-turn.”

The study's conclusion (p. 5) states:

“No additional measures are warranted to offset the direct impacts of the proposed school.”

A traffic control officer is an additional measure. These two statements cannot both be true. The study does not identify who would provide this officer, who would pay for it, or whether it would be required daily.

8. Traffic Counts Were Collected on the Old Route, Not the Proposed One (Study p. 16)

Page 16 states:

“GPI utilized turning movement counts collected at the study area intersection by Vanasse Hange Brustlin, Inc (VHB) in 2023...”

The 2023 counts were collected at South Street intersections under the existing routing, where buses travel via South Street. No turning movement counts were collected on Noyes Street, Cornell Street, or Cypress Street — the actual streets buses will use under the proposed plan.

The study redistributes volumes mathematically. It never observed traffic conditions on the roads that will carry daily bus traffic.

9. Enrollment Growth and Special Education Projection Not Adjusted

Accounted for: The study models transportation based on current vehicle counts.

Missing: The new school is designed for 900 students versus current enrollment of 825 — a 9% increase. No adjustment is made to bus counts, special education transport, or any other vehicle category to reflect the larger enrollment the school is being built to serve.

Our Request

We are not asking the board to take our word for any of this. Every issue above is sourced from the study's own pages. We ask the board to require the applicant to answer, on the record:

- Where do the 9 overflow buses go when the loop is at capacity?
- How does the service drive simultaneously serve buses, accessible vehicles, service trucks, and emergency vehicles?
- Why does the proposed model count 19 vehicles when 20 were observed?
- Where do after-school, athletic, field trip, and activity vehicles stage and depart?
- How do snow plows, garbage trucks, and food deliveries access the site and impact safety?
- Is a traffic control officer required or not — and if so, who provides and pays for it?

We request a vote be taken to halt the development until these critical issues are resolved with absolute clarity.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr and Mrs Albert Bargiel /Karina Mitchell Bargiel
37 Noyes Street, Concord, NH 03301