

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCE: December 19, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Alex Vogt
Bob Landry
C.R. Willeke
Darrel Elliott
Greg Placy
Jim Kirouac
Jon Evans
Jon Hebert
Kevin Nyhan
Marc Laurin
Mark Hemmerlein
Pete Stamnas
Randy Talon
Ron Crickard
Ron Kleiner
Steve Liakos

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Bill O'Donnell
Leigh Levine

NHDES

Chris Williams
Deb Loiselle
Gino Infascelli
Grace Levergood
Kevin Lucey
Steve Doyon
Ted Diers

NH Fish and Game

Cheri Patterson
Kim Tuttle
Mike Marchand

DRED

Tom Mansfield

EPA

Mark Kern

Army Corps of Engineers

Rich Roach

**Southern NH Planning
Commission**

Tim White

CLD Engineers

Jamie Paine

VHB

Pete Walker
Greg Bakos

ORW

Robert White

**Old Man of the
Mountain Legacy Fund**

Dick Hamilton

Stantec

Mike Chelminski

PRESENTATIONS/ PROJECTS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

[Finalization of October 17, 2007 Meeting Minutes](#)

[Londonderry, 13015 \(Non-Federal\)](#)

[Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-93-1\(174\), 10418C](#)

[SAFETEA-LU consultation & mitigation requirements for the Southern NH Planning Commission](#)

[Old Man Legacy Project](#)

[Hampton Falls-Hampton, 13408B \(Non-Federal\)](#)

[Winnicut River Dam Project \(#099.01\)](#)

[Milford, X-A000\(416\), 14492](#)

[Milford, X-A000\(565\), 14837](#)

[DES Land Resource Management Workshops](#) – As requested by Gino Infascelli

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization of October 17, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The October 17, 2007 meeting minutes were finalized.

Londonderry, 13015 (Non-Federal)

This project begins approximately 0.17 miles (900 ft) south of the NH Route 128 intersection with Stonehenge and Litchfield Roads, and runs northerly approximately 0.35 miles (1800 ft). This project involves the reconstruction of NH Route 128, Stonehenge, Litchfield and Bartley Hill Roads due to poor sight distance and prevalent accident history at the intersection. The intersection will be reconfigured and signalized. The work includes the addition of turn lanes, shoulders and a stone box culvert replacement.

NH Route 128 will be shifted approximately 12 feet to the east to eliminate impacts to two historic properties on the west side of NH Route 128 adjacent to Litchfield Road. Permanent wetland impacts total approximately 19,000 SF. At the previous meeting this was mistakenly presented as 2,500 SF. Since the October meeting the Department evaluated mitigation opportunities in Londonderry and has come up with the following mitigation package, which was reviewed with Lori Sommer, Rich Roach and Gino Infascelli:

1. DOT has suspended some of its standard practices in order to reduce impacts from 25,000 SF to 19,000 SF of permanent impacts. Specifically, there will be no clearing allowed within wetland areas beyond the proposed toe-of-slope. Typically, the Department would have a 5 ft clearing limit in fill areas and 10 ft in cut areas. Maintaining 4:1 slopes versus construction of 2:1 slope will allow for continued sheet flow into wetland areas and will not require guardrail. Reducing the footprint impacts by constructing 2:1 slopes would require curbing and direct outletting of roadway drainage to wetlands. In terms of water quality our design is better by allowing sheet flow to run over vegetated areas.
2. Eradicating a stand of Japanese knotweed, approximately 120 SF in area. This will include future maintenance of the area to ensure mortality.
3. Upsizing the replacement box culvert that carries Little Cohas Brook from the existing 6'w X 7' t X 30' l with a four sided box culvert with the dimensions 6' h X 9' w X 76' l. The box will be embedded 1' and filled with a gravelly material to mimic the existing streambed.
4. Construction of a grass line swale and basin area at the bottom of Bartley Hill Road to dissipate erosive forces and allow for daylighting of drainage prior to entering Little Cohas Brook. Directly piping this drainage to the brook would not daylight or provide the same level of sediment retention/nutrient uptake.
5. The original design of the outlet of the box culvert on Little Cohas Brook had much more extensive use of riprap to tie into the existing channel. The culvert as proposed now reduces the amount of permanent downstream work by approximately 30 linear feet.
6. Providing funding to the DES In-Lieu Fee fund to compensate approximately 10,000 SF of wetland impact. This will total approximately \$35,000.

No one objected to the mitigation as proposed and Rich Roach indicated that the project would qualify for under the State Programmatic General Permit.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-93-1(174), 10418C

This project consists of the widening of Interstate 93 between Salem and Manchester. The purpose of this meeting was to update resource agencies on the status and proposed scope of work for the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Pete Stamnas handed out the I-93 Corridor Newsletter and updated those in attendance on the on-going construction activities occurring at 5 sites along the corridor. He gave a brief overview of the lawsuit's November 30th final ruling and the negotiated work plan with the court. The Department will be advertising 3 additional projects in 2008. These involve the replacement of red-listed bridges at the Exit 3 area and reconstruction of the Exit 5 ramps. The main decree of the judge's decision is the development of a Supplemental EIS to evaluate the 8 lane alternatives and their induced growth impacts on secondary roadways. The Department is taking a two-step approach. Traffic modeling is presently on-going with environmental impact evaluations soon to follow. Public Informational meetings, to discuss the results of the modeling effort, will be scheduled in late-February or early March. The Draft SEIS is scheduled for completion in mid-April with a Public Hearing to be held in May. The intent is to complete the Final SEIS in early fall. Bill O'Donnell stated that FHWA is sending letters to NHDHR, NHDES, USEPA and USACOE advising them of their status in continuing to be Consulting Agencies for the project. Rich Roach inquired as to the limited nature of the SEIS. Bill O'Donnell replied that the focus will be on traffic impacts, and will mainly result in re-evaluation of the air and noise analysis. Mark Kern asked about the status of the CTAP process. Pete Stamnas replied that the first year allotments have been made and are listed on the I-93 website, other projects are on-going.

Mark Kern inquired on the chloride TMDL study. Marc Laurin replied that the draft reports for Policy Brook and the North Tributary to Canobie Lake watersheds have been made available for comments by DES. They are posted on DES' web site. The Beaver Brook and Dinsmore Brook reports are to be posted shortly. The Department is formulating comments/responses on the reports. Mark Hemmerlein stated that salt budgets are proposed in the reports and that sector allocations are different for each watershed, i.e. Beaver Brook and Policy Brook are dominated by parking lots (50%+) while Dinsmore Brook has 50% state roads and the Canobie Lake tributary is dominated by I-93. Mark Kern asked if the groundwater input was evaluated. The TMDLs only focused on surface water inputs, groundwater input were not analyzed. Kim Tuttle inquired as to the measures that may be taken by DOT to reduce spreading of salt such as dropping the speed limits during storm events. Pete Stamnas mentioned that several changes would be needed to achieve salt reduction and many options are in the mix. DES will need to publish the comments they receive on the TMDL and come up with an implementation plan and develop the criteria for allocation of funds so these funds can be approved by the Towns at yearly town budget meetings in 2009.

SAFETEA-LU consultation & mitigation requirements for the Southern NH Planning Commission

This discussion follows up on previous discussions regarding SAFETEA-LU planning/environmental consultation and mitigation requirements. Leigh Levine from FHWA solicited comments and suggestions from information provided during the October 17, 2007 meeting. He then invited Tim White, Senior Planner, at the SNHPC to provide highlights of the plan.

Tim White stated that the plan was developed in July 2007 to be in compliance with SAFETEA-LU.

The comments from the resource agencies reflected previous discussions which, in summary, consisted of the following:

1. Examining restoration/creation choices in light of the ACOEs recent push for creation over restoration/enhancement.
2. Considering the region's landscape, and tying in the transportation plan to protected wildlife and water supply areas.
3. Utilizing NH Fish & Game's Wildlife Action Plan as a resource. It is available on the Fish & Game website.
4. Considering cumulative impacts and in-lieu fee options for mitigation.
5. Further investigations into impacts on cultural resources. The OEP's State Development Plan is a good example for consideration of cultural resources within a broader planning document. The NHDOT Memorandum of Understanding on cultural resource assessments is a good resource.

Mike Marchand asked if each of the larger projects would go through a review process. Tim White responded yes and Kevin Nyhan added that each would go through the Natural Resource Agency Coordination meetings when appropriate.

Old Man Legacy Project

Greg Placy began the presentation with background and a brief history of the Old Man of the Mountain. He then turned the presentation over to Dick Hamilton. Dick Hamilton explained that the project to memorialize the Old Man would consist of a park and sculpture garden with 5 granite blocks, each weighing 150-155 tons. The granite blocks would be quarried at the Rock of Ages Quarry in Barry, VT. When viewed in series, they would replicate the former face of the Old Man. In addition, there would be several viewing stations to enable visitors to view the old profile on the mountain. At that point, Dick Hamilton showed a video of the idea behind the park.

Greg Placy then discussed the environmental implications of this undertaking. Construction of the park would require impacts/access within the Limited Access Right-of-Way (LAROW) of the Franconia Notch Parkway. This break in access of the LAROW would require environmental approval from FHWA. Preliminary wetland impacts would total approximately 2,000-3,000 sf.

VHB consultants will be doing the design and environmental work for the project. Gino Infascelli reminded that in April 2008 new Comprehensive Shoreland Protection (CSPA) laws go into effect. Peter Walker recognized that this area is the headwaters of the Pemigewasset River and indicated that the wetlands permit would be applied for prior to April and asked for clarification that the project would be grandfathered under the rules that were in effect during the time of application.

Gino Infascelli agreed. Pete Walker added that a bio-retention area might be constructed to treat stormwater runoff prior to entering wetlands or surface waters.

Gino Infascelli asked if a NHB search had been completed. Pete Walker indicated that one had not yet been completed, but would definitely be done as everyone recognizes the need.

The project will be presented again when the design and impact determinations are further along.

Gino Infascelli requested that the minutes include a link to an upcoming *Land Resource Management Workshops* at DES to present the changes in the CSPA. The site may be accessed at: <http://www.des.state.nh.us/workshop/default.asp>.

Hampton Falls-Hampton, 13408B (Non-Federal)

This project involves replacing the bridge that carries Interstate 95 over Taylor River, between Hampton and Hampton Falls. In addition, the Department is engaged in a feasibility study to determine the appropriate treatment of an associated dam, overflow culvert and fish ladder.

Bob Landry, Project Manager for the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT) gave an overview of the presentation made at the October 29, 2007 public information meeting for the proposed project. The dam that creates the Taylor River impoundment was built in 1949 and is in need of repair. The current dam does not meet dam safety standards. In the 1960's a fish ladder was constructed and attached to the dam. The fish ladder is also in need of repair because its current configuration is not attracting fish effectively during high water events. The abutments of the bridge (steel sheet piles) that carry Interstate 95 (I95) over the Taylor River are beginning to deteriorate and are also in need of repair. This project intends to repair or replace the bridge and to investigate repair, relocation, or removal of the dam and fish ladder.

To determine the best solution for these problems, a feasibility study is underway to develop and evaluate alternatives, and to identify the best alternative to accomplish the purpose and need of the overall project. There are three alternatives available – no action; repairing the existing bridge and a constructing new bridge. The feasibility study indicated that repairing the bridge in place while maintaining I95 traffic and the water flow of the Taylor River was not feasible and therefore, the new bridge should be built in a different location.

The best location for replacing the bridge is to relocate it to its historic riverbed location (approximately 500 feet south of its current location). This is the approximate location of the riverbed channel prior to the dam being constructed. With this determined, there were two alternatives available: a new bridge (at historic riverbed location) with a dam and fishway that would preserve the current pond elevation, or a new bridge (at historic riverbed location) with removal of the dam that eliminates the current pond and returns this section of the Taylor River to a free-flowing river.

The Mother's Day flood of May 2006 caused water levels within the impoundment to rise to an elevation of approximately 15.7, which was above the home sills (el. 14.25) of a few houses in Taylor River Estates. This storm also caused the interruption of traffic in the southbound lanes of

I-95. The new dam alternative would lower the 100-year flood elevation by 2.4 feet (el. 13.3), which would be below the lowest home sill's elevation by almost one foot. The dam removal alternative would lower the flood elevation even more to an elevation of 9.0 feet, which is the 100-year flood elevation from the Town's FEMA Flood Insurance Study.

The new dam and fishway alternative would continue river herring (*Alosa pseudoharengus* and *Alosa aestivalis*) passage into the pond, as well as maintain the resident fishery. The dam removal alternative would eliminate the impoundment, reverting the Taylor River back to a freshwater/tidal environment. The river would be restored as a tidal coastal system, which would freely open the river to diadromous, estuarine, and marine species producing a saltwater fishery and improve the poor water quality conditions within the impoundment.

The new dam alternative would not change the existing poor water quality condition of the impoundment, for example the low dissolved oxygen in the deeper areas of the impoundment in summer. The dam removal alternative would eliminate the impoundment and restore the tidal river, thereby allowing the dynamic processes of the river system to improve the water quality and sediment transport issues.

The new dam and fishway alternative would not impact the existing wetland types. The dam removal alternative would revert the riverine habitat to a mosaic of tidal creek, salt marsh, freshwater marsh and wooded wetlands. There would be a reduction of freshwater wetland functions while reverting to the former estuarine community.

The new dam alternative would not impact the shallow or bedrock wells that surround the pond as the surface water level would not change. For the dam removal alternative, there is no anticipated impact to bedrock wells lacking fractured bedrock connections to the river. The shallow aquifer and community wells are more susceptible to a lowering of the water table. Further study would be necessary to refine the potential zone of saltwater intrusion.

The new dam and fishway alternative could potentially affect archeological resources for construction activities occurring outside areas of previously disturbed highway construction. The dam removal alternative could potentially affect archeological resources by exposing sensitive historic anthropogenic areas. The NH Division of Historic Resources (NHDHR) has been consulted relative to this proposed project and the various alternatives. Additional consultations with the NHDHR may be required to discuss the need for additional studies on archeological resources.

The socio-economic environment includes the impact to the public for each of the alternatives for the project. Areas affected include recreational opportunities and aesthetics. The new dam and fishery alternative would improve the socioeconomic condition in the form of improvements to the existing fishery resources and possible increased usage of the resource. The dam removal alternative would substantially alter the current habitat characteristics, recreational uses and scenic views within the impoundment, but would substantially improve the natural dynamic state of the Taylor River.

Sediment and fish sampling was conducted at various locations in the impoundment. The NH Fish and Game Department conducted the fish sampling. Fine-grained organic-rich sediment with an

average thickness of one foot has accumulated since the dam was built. Both sediment and fish tissues contain pesticides (DDD, DDT, & DDE).

Regarding human health risks, the pesticide concentrations measured in the sediment do not pose a risk to human health from direct exposure. Similarly, there is no risk of adverse human health effects from the consumption of Taylor River fish at the rate recommended in the Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) statewide fish consumption advisory. (The advisory already recommends reduced fish consumption due to mercury concerns in New Hampshire).

Sediment in the lower impoundment (closest to the dam) poses unacceptable risk to benthic organisms impacting the aquatic ecosystem. Pesticide concentrations in the sediment have bioaccumulated in fish to levels that pose unacceptable ecological risk to the wildlife that forage on them. As a result, appropriate measures are being investigated that will address these risks under the various alternatives considered by NHDOT.

The next steps in the process include collecting additional comments from resource agencies and the public, finalizing the draft feasibility study, disseminating it to the public and holding additional public informational meetings and selecting the preferred alternative. The Department envisions conducting a Public Informational Meeting in January or February of 2008. The project is funded with 100% turnpike funds and was recently listed as a high priority for the turnpike as a result of the toll increase. The cost of the new bridge and dam would be approximately \$9.5 million, and approximately \$8 million without the dam. Addressing issues associated with the contaminated soil could affect each of these estimates. The project is tentatively scheduled to advertise for bids in the winter of 2009 with construction during 2009 and 2010.

The meeting was then opened for questions and comments.

Rich Roach asked if the alternative that replaces the bridge would stop the flooding? The response was yes, either of the alternatives would alleviate the flooding concerns.

Gino Infascelli asked about the size of the existing bridge? The existing bridge is 15' wide. The replacement structure would be 75' wide. He further inquired as to how to improve the fishery and if the new dam would perpetuate poor water quality? The response was "Yes," poor water quality would be perpetuated. Finally, he asked if the new dam would NOT improve the fishery? Cheri Patterson responded that the fishery would not be improved with new dam and that adjacent development affects the water quality.

Mark Kern asked about the dimensions of the dam? It is 17' high to the road, and 8' high to the spillway crest.

Ted Diers asked if the new spillway would be the same height as the existing, not lower? The new spillway would be the same height. A lower height was studied, however maintaining the spillway height would reduce flooding to elevation 13.3 (100-year storm).

Grace Levergood indicated that the new dam would still be a high hazard dam and that more hydraulics needs to be done for the Probable Maximum Flood.

Mark Kern asked who would pay for the removal? The Feasibility Study is funded through Turnpike funds, NH Estuaries program and the Gulf of Maine Council (GOMC). The project will be funded through Turnpike funds.

Rich Roach asked who the DOT partnered with on this project and if there were Federal Highway participation. There is no FHWA participation. The DOT has partnered with NHDES, NOAA, NHF&G and GOMC. He then asked if a US Coast Guard permit was needed. The DOT is looking into whether a Coast Guard permit would be needed. He then added that the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires restoring the integrity of the Nation's waters and that restoration is important. The Department will need to be compliant with the Coastal Zone Management Act, which can consist of the restoration of estuaries. Taylor River may also be Essential Fish Habitat (EFH).

Mark Kern asked for a summary of comments from the Public Informational Meeting. In general, the residents wanted to keep the dam to maintain property values, fire suppression capabilities, and water supply wells. Deb Loiselle indicated that this is not an unusual comment. It is incumbent upon the project sponsors to provide pros and cons of each alternative.

Bob Landry indicated that the town is still gathering input.

Rich Roach indicated that the project would need to undergo the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, which includes public involvement. Furthermore, the project would probably require a Section 404 permit, unless the project can be considered maintenance of transportation infrastructure, which can be outside the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. He suggested that the Department complete more public involvement, given the project sensitivity. The Department really needs answers to the drinking water well questions, fire supply water questions, and other issues.

Cheri Patterson indicated that the project sponsors need to provide more public education on the benefit of tidal areas.

Bob Landry indicated that the additional work would mean that the Department would not meet the February 2009 bid date. He then asked if the Department could solve the low dissolved oxygen (DO) levels, would fish come back. Cheri Patterson responded in the affirmative.

Winnicut River Dam Project (#099.01)

The proposed work for this project consists of the removal of the Winnicut Dam and construction of a technical fishpass under the NH Route 33 Bridge. The proposed fishpass is intended to provide upstream fish passage under the bridge, and is necessitated by fill placed in the river as part of its construction in 1959.

Introduction to the project and project team by Deb Loiselle (NHDES).

Presentation of Project by Michael Chelminski (Stantec, formally Woodlot Alternatives, Inc.)
The project was initiated in 2003 with studies and analyses later incorporated into the Winnicut Dam Removal Feasibility Study (FS). Based on the information presented in the FS, the owner of

the dam (NHF&GD) selected dam removal as the preferred alternative at the project site. The proposed action includes removal of the existing dam and associated fish ladder located adjacent to the left abutment of the dam and construction of a fishpass under the Rte. 33 Bridge approximately 250 ft upstream from the dam.

Site-specific factors considered in the preferred alternative included the potential to restore both rainbow smelt spawning areas and intertidal habitat in the approximately 250 ft long reach of the Winnicut River between the Winnicut Dam and Rte. 33 Bridge. Prior to construction of the dam in 1957, the Winnicut River supported a recreational fishery for rainbow smelt. Recent studies indicate that smelt populations are very limited in the Winnicut River. A primary goal of the project is therefore to restore smelt spawning habitat.

The proposed work includes removal of the Winnicut Dam and installation of fishpass under the Rte 33 Bridge. The proposed fishpass under the Rte. 33 Bridge is necessitated by fill placed in the river during its construction in 1959. Approximately ¼-acres of fill was placed in the river as part of this work, including approximately 7 to 8 vertical feet of fill under the bridge. The purpose of the fishpass is to provide river herring with access to spawning habitat in the Winnicut River upstream from Rte. 33.

The project partners included coordination of regulatory issues from the inception of the FS, and emphasized coordination with the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR), including the preparation of materials requested by NHDHR. Permitting work to date has been focused on state permits through NHDES and federal permits through the US Army Corps of Engineers. In addition, the consulting team will research the need for a permit from the Coast Guard which may be required for the construction of the fishpass.

The fishpass design and construction methods are intended to maintain the structural integrity of the Rte. 33 Bridge, and will incorporate scour countermeasures intended to protect the bridge substructure elements. As part of this work, hydrologic statistics developed for the FS will be reevaluated in light of more recent flooding events in NH. Construction access for the project work would be from the existing gravel road that runs from Rte. 33 to the right abutment of the dam on NHF&GD property. Construction work would result in temporary impacts associated with construction activities and equipment access for dam removal and construction of the fishpass. Where practical, impacts to the existing thalweg of the river between the dam and bridge will be minimized. While the project work will result in some temporary impacts, the restoration of intertidal resources will result in net benefits to all natural resources in the project area.

Comments, Questions and Responses

Grace Levergood: How is the fishpass connected to the bridge?

Mike Chelminski: The fishpass is structurally independent from the bridge, but proposed work will include reconstruction of bridge scour countermeasures.

Rich Roach: What will the cross-section look like?

Mike Chelminski: (A Cross-section sketch was made on the wall exhibit.) A sheet pile cutoff wall, intended to control seepage at the upstream end of the fishpass, will be installed to minimize

seepage through underlying material. This will minimize flow under the fishpass to maintain year-round flow through the fishpass.

Rich Roach: Who will own the fishpass?
Cheri Patterson: NHF&GD

Bob Landry: How will the sheet pile wall be supported?

Mike Chelminski: The sheet pile will be driven down to refusal and bolstered with material underlying the fishpass.

Ted Diers: Comment: The existing Route 33 Bridge is more of a dam than the existing dam.

Mike Chelminski: Comment: During high flows the Rte 33 Bridge creates a backwater that is independent of the backwater created by the existing dam, and thus the bridge is hydraulically a dam. The proposed fishpass will meet the definition of a dam according to NHDES criteria following removal of the dam.

Rich Roach: Comment: Rich envisions that once the proposed fishpass is removed NHDOT should replace/repair the bridge.

Mike Chelminski: Mike noted that there have been several previous meetings with NHDOT during and following the project feasibility study phase.

A State Programmatic General Permit (SPGP) is appropriate based on comments from Rich Roach. Mark Kern concurred.

Mike Chelminski: Mike asked Gino Infascelli to provide interpretation of whether the 100-ft tidal buffer zone can be set along the crest of the dam or whether it should be 100 ft upstream from the crest of the dam.

Gino Infascelli: Responded that tidal buffer should be offset 100 ft upstream from the dam, noting that if the river did not exist the tidal buffer would be offset 100 ft landward from the highest observable tide line (as if it were a tidal wall).

Milford X-A000(565), 14837 & Milford, X-A000(416), 14492

Jamie Paine from CLD Engineers presented this project which consists of two separate contracts in the downtown and South Street areas of Milford, NH.

SOUTH STREET IMPROVEMENTS

This project involves improvements to South Street in Milford. The project, which has federal funds, would improve overall safety for motorists and pedestrians on South Street from its intersection with Union Square to the railroad crossing between Clinton and Lincoln Streets in Milford. The Town is currently going through the early public input phase of the project. Improvements are expected to include, but may not be limited to, sidewalk reconstruction, roadway widening, and pedestrian safety enhancements, curbing and turning radius improvements, and aesthetic improvements such as lighting, undergrounding of utilities, and landscaping.

DOWNTOWN IMPROVEMENTS

Jamie also explained, that a second series of projects are being proposed to improve traffic flow along NH Route 101A (Nashua Street and Elm Street), NH Route 13 (Mont Vernon Street), and the downtown “Oval”, also known as Union Square, in Milford. The exact locations of the projects have not been finalized at this time. The Town is currently going through the early public input phase on these efforts too. Improvements include, but may not be limited to, roadway improvements, new sidewalks and sidewalk reconstruction, modifications to crosswalks and pedestrian islands, relocation and undergrounding of utilities, parking improvements, traffic control, drainage, and aesthetics.

INPUT RECEIVED

ACOE: Rich Roach had no concerns with the project(s) at this point. Once more formal improvements are developed for the downtown projects, plans should be brought back to this group for review.

EPA: Mark Kern stated that, if possible, Low Impact Development (LID) methods should be considered. This might include the use of pervious pavement on the sidewalks to reduce runoff and infiltration areas adjacent to parking lots.

NHF&G: Mike Marchand stated that if the parking lot located west of South Street and behind the downtown buildings is reconfigured, thought should be given to incorporating a better vegetated buffer between the parking lot(s) and Railroad Pond.