



# MEETING MINUTES

---

**DATE OF MEETING:** 2/13/18

**ATTENDEES:** Mr. Joe Adams, P.E., NHDOT  
Ms. Jennifer Reczek, P.E., NHDOT  
Mr. Tony Weatherbee, NHDOT  
Mr. Jon Evans, NHDOT  
Mr. Thom Marshall, P.E., Kleinfelder  
Ms. Tania Berk, Twin Brook Lane Resident  
Ms. Robin Davis, Twin Brook Lane Resident  
Mr. John Graham, NH House – Bedford  
Mr. Chris Bandazian, Bedford Town Council  
Ms. Becky Hebert, AICP,, Bedford Planning Director  
Ms. Jeanne Walker, P.E., Bedford Town Engineer  
Lt. Michael Bernard, Bedford Police  
Ms. Jamie Spittle, Twin Brook Lane Resident

**RECORDED BY:** Mr. Thomas Marshall, P.E.

**CC:** file

**SUBJECT:** Public Informational Meeting - Bedford 13609C Project  
NH Route 101 over Pulpit Brook

**KLEINFELDER NO.:** 20172401

---

The general format for the meeting consisted of the following:

1. Viewing of board exhibits by meeting attendees
2. Project discussions between Twin Brook Lane residents and DOT representatives prior to formal presentation
3. Slide show presentation by Jennifer Reczek and Jon Evans which covered the following topics:
  - a. Project Location
  - b. Existing Conditions
  - c. Natural and Cultural Resources Update
  - d. Alternatives Analysis Summary including Preferred Alternative
4. Post Presentation Questions and Answers Session

---

Below is a general summary of the questions and topics of concern that were discussed prior to, during and after DOT's presentation:

- Request for left hand turn lane into Twin Brook Lane
  - History of accidents at Twin Brook Lane.
    - Tania Berk was personally involved in an accident in the last year while trying to make the left hand turn lane.
    - There was a fatality involving a baby sitter 10+ years ago. Family has since left the development.
  - There have been previous requests by Twin Brook Lane residents to the Town to add a left hand turn lane.
  - A formal letter prepared by the Town of Bedford requesting that a left hand turn lane be incorporated into the bridge project was provided to DOT at the meeting.
  - It was discussed that Labelle Winery had to install a left hand turn lane.
  - A left hand lane turn added on Route 101 in Amherst was also mentioned.
  - It was mentioned that solar glare is an issue at sunset when travelling west.
- Parking concerns on Twin Brook Lane and along Route 101
  - Functions at Labelle Winery are causing overflow parking near Twin Brook Lane.
    - Cars often park along 101 at the intersection of Twin Brook Lane introducing sight distance issues for vehicles exiting Twin Brook Lane.
    - Vehicles are also parking along Twin Brook Lane during certain events causing a restriction in the roadway width.
  - Bragdon Farm sledding hill has similarly causes overflow parking onto Twin Brook Lane
  - There were discussions between residents and the Town around the addition of "No Parking" Signs on Twin Brook Lane and parking monitoring by the Bedford Police Department to help discourage the overflow parking situation.
- Pink wetlands flag removal
  - DOT stated that these could be removed in the spring.
- Access to fire ponds
  - Ms. Davis stated that access needs to be maintained during construction. DOT stated that Twin Brook Lane will not be used as a contractor staging area and that it was anticipated that the closed portion of Route 101 on each side of the bridge would serve as the staging areas.
- Twin Brook Lane Intersection with Route 101
  - Miss Davis asked since the State has R.O.W. who is legally responsible for maintaining the first 50' of Twin Brook Lane? The State or Town?
  - She stated visibility concerns due to snowbanks during winter months. Also concerns over condition of the existing pavement.

- DOT responded that they are not responsible for maintaining local roads.
- Preferred bypass alternative concerns
  - Landscaping impacts to 2 Twin Brook Lane and 3 Twin Brook Lane were discussed. DOT explained that the loss of any existing landscaping that is located within DOT's Right-of-Way (R.O.W.) will not be compensated for but loss of any impacted landscaping on private property would be compensated for as part of the Right-of-Way process.
  - Septic/leach field impacts for 2 Twin Brook Lane were discussed. DOT explained that the temporary bypass alignment as presented is conceptual and will be further refined in an effort to avoid impacts to the existing septic system/leach field. Confirmation of the exact location of the existing septic system is needed.
  - Lt. Bernard asked whether there will there be speed reduction during construction. DOT replied that the project site will be posted for 40 mph during construction. Ms. Davis asked if that reduction could be made permanent. DOT answered no, they don't typically down post for speeding concerns and that speed limit postings are a function of the design speed of the roadway.
  - Lt. Bernard asked if there will be two-way traffic during construction. DOT responded yes.
  - Lt. Bernard questioned what the temporary roadway width will be. DOT stated that a 32 foot width between barriers would be provided (Two 11 foot lanes with 5 foot shoulders).
  - Ms. Berk asked how long the diversion will be active. DOT responded that traffic would be using the bypass for approximately 3-4 months.
  - There was a discussion on the anticipated level of police presence during construction. DOT stated that there would not be full time police detail but that police detail would be used during specific aspects of construction. Lt. Bernard stated that additional police details can be used to enforce speed limit if deemed necessary.
- Concerns over downstream flooding
  - NHDOT explained that a comprehensive hydrologic and hydraulic analysis was completed as part of the alternatives analysis and that analysis showed that increasing the hydraulic opening of the Route 101 crossing would not increase the potential for downstream flooding.
  - It was questioned whether the new development near the animal hospital was considered in the analysis and NHDOT responded that analysis takes a much larger drainage area into account when determining flows through the site and that site specific changes as a result of new developments would not affect the parameters that were assumed in the analysis.
  - There was discussion as to whether the downstream bridge would be removed as part of the project. DOT explained that the existing (potentially historic) bridge downstream of the Route 101 crossing would not be impacted by the project and that the hydraulic analysis looked at

---

scenarios with and without the downstream bridge in place and removal of the bridge was not ultimately recommended as it would not affect downstream flood levels.

- Endangered Species Question
  - Clarification on endangered species was requested and NHDOT explained that the project was flagged for potential impacts to the Blandings Turtle and that provisions would be included in the contract documents to address these impacts.
- Stormwater Treatment Discussion
  - NHDOT explained that Bedford is an MS4 community in which case the project will be designed to treat all proposed impervious areas.
- Staged Construction Alternative Discussion
  - DOT explained that constructing the project in stages was evaluated as a means of reducing impacts but it was determined that it wasn't practical because the required temporary lane widths still pushed project outside of the R.O.W.
- Engine braking (noise) concern
  - Concern over the noise associated with engine braking was raised. The question whether signage could be added to restrict engine braking but Jon Evans (NHDOT BOE Program manager for Air and Noise) replied that the State cannot install signage to restrict engine braking because of liability reasons.
- Construction Funding Discussion
  - There was a general discussion around the timing and cost of the project as depicted in the 10 year plan. Ms. Davis asked about cost and whether \$2.2M was sufficient for the 2020/2021 construction date. NHDOT replied that inflation has been taken into account and that the current \$2.2M is higher than 10 year plan estimate of \$1.99M.