ACEC-NH/NHDOT
Highway Design Sub-Committee

In-Person Meeting with Zoom Virtual Option
January 13, 2026
8:00 am – 9:00 am

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

☐	Jim Marshall	NHDOT, Chair	☒	Brian Colburn	MJ
☒	Ronald Grandmaison,	NHDOT	☒	Benjamin Martin	VHB
☒	Curtis Morrill	NHDOT	☒	Phil Kendall	H&H (Scribe)
☒	Corey Spetelunas	NHDOT	☒	Kyle Higgins	GPI
☒	Cassandra Burns	NHDOT	☒	Seth Hill	GM2
☒	Jonathan Hebert	NHDOT	☒	Nicole Fox	F&O

Introductory Remarks

Ron opened the meeting at 8:00 am asking if anyone has comments on the meeting minutes from the October 14th meeting. The minutes were accepted and asked for the RSA link to be updated.

ADA Accessible Postings

- The Federal deadline is April 2026.
- NHDOT has set an internal deadline of February 2026.
    - NHDOT has run into some challenges.

Design Report

- ***Action Item: Corey will take another pass through the document and will send to the Highway Subcommittee for another review.***

Check List

The committee went through the updated checklist which now includes:

- A new "Drainage Profiles" section under the Slope & Drain submission tab.
- A newly added ROW section.

The following discussions occurred regarding the current checklists:

- ROW Section:
    - The section originated from the ROW Bureau.
    - It is not currently open for discussion or review.
    - Ron requested any comments from the group that he can relay to the ROW Bureau.

- Drainage Profile:

Discussion focused on the current sample drainage profile posted on NHDOT's website.

- Profile Scale
  - The sample scale of 1:10 may be too large for some projects.
    - Concerns were raised about the ability to see sufficient detail of proposed structures.
    - Closely spaced structures may be difficult to distinguish at this scale.
  - Ron noted that the intent is to ensure all information is legible.
  - The committee discussed using mixed scales within a single project.
    - The committee agreed this would be acceptable provided scales are clearly labeled and legible.
  - Text legibility was noted as one of the most important features.
    - Visibility of connections and conflicts is also critical.
  - The idea of adding insets to show finer detail was discussed.
    - While useful, the Department is trying to avoid creating additional work for designers.
  - The use of vertical exaggeration was discussed.
    - Ron asked what other states are doing.
    - The group noted that sewer profiles are typically exaggerated.
    - Ben noted this could increase the total number of sheets.
    - Ron stated exaggeration should be left to designer discretion on a project-by-project basis.

- Crossing Features
  - Currently only ROW is shown.
  - The committee discussed possibly adding EP, TW, and GR.
  - Curtis noted the need to balance the amount of information with visual clutter.

- Subgrade
  - Brian noted the subgrade linestyle may not be easily visible without special symbology.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate possible inclusion options.***

- Proposed features
  - Brian suggested adding proposed curb, GR, and ROW to highlight potential conflicts.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate possible inclusion.***

- Effort to add the Existing Drainage Note and Utility Labels
  - • The committee asked whether the labels shown in the sample profile were placed automatically or manually.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate how the labels were added and report back to the committee.***

- Intersecting pipes at basins
  - Discussion focused on how the Department prefers this information to be displayed.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate and report back to the committee.***

- Structure and Pipe Information
  - Corey asked whether separating structure and pipe information into different labels was intentional.
  - It was noted that this is a result of automation, as the software labels individual elements.

- Complicated system sample
  - The provided sample represents a relatively straightforward closed drainage system.
  - The committee agreed that an example of a more complex system would be helpful.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate possible inclusion of a more complex sample.***

- Linking plan information to drainage profiles
  - Corey asked if there has been consideration of adding labels in the plans identifying which drainage profile corresponds to plan features.
  - The idea of a "Drainage Profile Key Plan" was discussed.
    - NHDOT emphasized avoiding additional workload.
  - Brian noted he has added a note at the bottom of profiles indicating which Drainage Notes (# to ##) are covered.
    - If this approach is used, system numbering becomes important.
  - Corey asked whether individual profiles would be listed separately in the sheet index.
    - The committee agreed this was not necessary but emphasized appropriate organization.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will add a checklist line confirming that drainage profiles are organized.***

- Angle callouts
  - The discussion centered on what the sample is using as zero.
    - Typically, zero represents the outlet pipe.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate and report back to the committee.***

- Depth callouts
  - The sample calculates depth from rim to sump, not to the bottom of the structure.
    - This does not align with specification language.
    - If corrected, the information could be exported and used for quantity calculations.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate and see if this can be adjusted.***

- Cross Culverts
  - Previously shown as skewed cross sections.
  - The committee agreed cross culverts should now be shown as separate drainage profiles.

- Drainage Profile Limits
  - There is currently no guidance on how far past the outlets and inlets need to be shown.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate and report back to the committee.***

- Profile Direction
  - There is currently no guidance on whether profiles should be shown downstream-to-upstream or in stationing direction.
    - Downstream-to-upstream may conflict with stationing.
    - Committee preference is to show from downstream to upstream.
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT will investigate and report back to the committee.***

- Existing Ground Elevations
  - The committee agreed it is unnecessary to label elevations every 50 feet.
  - A separate, distinct tick mark should be added to identify 50-foot stations.

- Minor Grid
  - The current minor grid color makes profiles appear cluttered.
  - The committee agreed the profiles would benefit from screening the minor grid similar to cross sections.
    - This would help reduce text conflicts.

- Pavement Marking
  - It was noted that the checklist does not require curb mark numbers
  - ***Action Item: NHDOT to add a line to the check list.***

Next meeting: April 14, 2026

Distribution: Committee Members.