

March 29, 2011

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
BUREAU OF HIGHWAY DESIGN**

**CONFERENCE REPORT**

**PROJECT:** ENFIELD  
12967B  
X-A001(087)  
Main Street / Rail Trail Crossing

**DATE OF CONFERENCE:** March 14, 2011

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** Enfield Community Building, Enfield

**ATTENDED BY:** Alex Vogt  
John Butler  
Approx. 60 local officials and other attendees (see attached sign-in sheets)

**SUBJECT:** Public Informational Meeting

**NOTES ON CONFERENCE:**

Alex Vogt summarized the input received at the November 17, 2010 Public Informational Meeting. The meeting attendees provided comments on what the perceived problems are with the current situation and what the project should try to achieve:

**Summary of Problems with Current Situation:**

- The existing low clearance does not allow for adequate emergency response,
- Has bad visibility for motorists, bikes, and pedestrians going under bridge,
- Decreases safety for bikes and pedestrians,
- Encourages high snow mobile speed,
- Generates noise with horns/ alternating one-way traffic under bridge.

**Summary of Vision**

- Safe Intersection, especially pedestrians
- Improved emergency response and large vehicle access
- Slower Speeds (cars and snowmobiles)
- Open Views of Lake

- Recreational Access to Lake
- Enhanced Rail Trail features
- Better pedestrian connections

The two alternatives presented at that meeting were the grade separated crossing with an over passing rail trail bridge, and an at-grade crossing with the rail trail being lowered by about 10' using 5% grades to match the Main Street elevation. Public comments at the meeting generally favored the at-grade alternative. It was also noted that minimizing impacts to the former motel property was important so that it could potentially be used for recreational purposes such as lake or rail-trail access.

John Butler noted that the project was also reviewed with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in December 2010. The railroad corridor, including the bridge, are historic resources. Federal guidelines require that the avoidance or minimization of impacts to these historic resources will need to be given strong consideration. SHPO's preference is to see little or no change to the historic railroad bed profile, and they would like to see the existing bridge preserved even if Main Street is relocated.

John summarized the alternatives that were presented at the November Public Informational meeting:

#### No Build

Main Street would continue to pass underneath the existing rail-trail bridge as it does today. The emergency access road could either remain in place or be removed after the new bridge over Mascoma Lake is open to traffic.

#### Alternative 1

Construct a grade separated crossing with a new bridge carrying the rail-trail over Main Street. Main Street would be relocated slightly to the east. The rail-trail would be raised by approximately 8 feet to achieve appropriate vertical clearance over Main Street. Short 5% grades would be required on the rail-trail approaches to the bridge. A sidewalk would be constructed along Main Street to connect the existing sidewalk north of Sargent Street to the proposed sidewalk that will be constructed on the new bridge over Mascoma Lake. This sidewalk connection would be part of the proposed layout with any of the alternatives. This alternative impacts the rail-trail bridge and profile, and has a small impact on the former motel property.

#### Alternative 2

Construct an at-grade Main Street/rail-trail crossing by raising Main Street slightly and lowering the rail-trail. The rail-trail would be lowered by approximately 9 feet with 4% or 5% grades leading down to Main Street and short landing areas at the bottom. Main Street would be realigned similar to Alternative 1. Lowering the rail-trail may impact an underground fiber

optic cable that runs along the rail corridor. This alternative impacts the rail-trail bridge and profile, and has a small impact on the former motel property.

John went on to described three new alternatives that were developed based on the input from the Public Informational and SHPO meetings. All involve an at-grade trail crossing with little or no impacts to the rail trail profile, and would preserve the existing bridge for trail use.

### Alternative 3

Upgrade the existing emergency access road to become a permanent relocation of Main Street. The south end of the access road would be realigned to become free-flow rather than a 90 degree turn, the profile be flattened near the rail trail crossing (currently about 8%), and the entire roadway would need to be widened. A “T” intersection would remain near the north end of the project. This alternative would not impact the rail-trail profile or bridge, but would impact the entire former motel property.

### Alternative 4

Relocate Main Street opposite Sargent Street, forming a 4-leg intersection which would operate as either a 3-way or 4-way stop. The rail-trail would need to be lowered by approximately 3 feet to match the elevation of Main Street. The rail-trail profile would be modified with a 1% grade on the north side of Main Street and a short 5% grade on the south side. The existing bridge would not be impacted. Approximately two thirds of the former motel property would be impacted.

### Alternative 5

Relocate Main Street with short reversing curves (minimum radii for a 30 mph design speed), keeping it as a free-flow roadway similar to Alternative 2. Main Street would be raised to match the elevation of the rail-trail. A design concern with this alternative is that the position of the crest in Main Street relative to the horizontal curves could make it difficult for drivers to see the horizontal curves after traveling over the crest. This alternative would not impact the rail-trail profile or bridge, but would impact approximately two thirds of the former motel property.

Alex Vogt noted that a matrix (attached) had been prepared showing the relative impacts of the various alternatives on a number of the issues identified in the Problem and Vision summaries. It also shows estimated construction costs of all the alternatives.

Alex discussed some potential traffic calming techniques that could be utilized on Main Street in the vicinity of an at-grade trail crossing to try to improve safety. The techniques discussed included enhanced crosswalk markings, refuge islands, and speed tables.

The meeting was then opened to questions and comments.

Questions and Comments:

Selectman Kluge stated that the Selectmen are unanimously opposed to Alternative 1, and that he supports Alternative 2. He feels that Alternative 2 will enhance the Town by allowing for public access to the lake and by opening up views of the lake. He suggested that perhaps Alternative 2 could be “tweaked” to address the historic concerns. He also stated that he does not support the No Build alternative, even if Alternative 2 is not able to move forward.

Several others spoke in favor of Alternative 2, with similar reasons as Selectman Kluge. It was commented that preservation of the lake should be more important than preserving the rail corridor and bridge. It was noted that Alternative 2 keeps the roadway the furthest away from the lake, and that DES may have concerns with the alternatives that move the road closer to the lake.

Late in the meeting, an attendee called for a show of hands from those who favor Alternative 2. A show of hands was also requested for each of the other alternatives. A strong majority of those who raised their hands favored Alternative 2.

Alex Bernhard, speaking on behalf of the Friends of the Northern Rail Trail in Grafton and Merrimack Counties, stated that his group supports Alternative 3, although they could live with Alternative 5. He noted that over \$500,000 has been invested in improvements to the rail-trail over the years, and preserving the flat grades on the existing trail is of primary importance.

Several comments were made regarding the historic nature and importance of the railroad corridor and bridge. This did not appear to be a serious constraint previously, but now it is? SHPO had been OK with Alternative 1, which removed the existing bridge and changed the rail-trail profile, so why would they be against Alternative 2? It was noted that many other bridges have been removed along this railroad corridor, so why is this one so important? Meredith Smith, Enfield Heritage Commission, noted that the historic restrictions are coming from the State level, not the local level, and that she supports Alternative 2. It was suggested that the Enfield Heritage Commission should send a letter to SHPO stating their position. Alex Vogt noted that the Heritage Commission, or anyone else with an interest in the project, can request to become a Consulting Party to the historic review process.

It was asked what the project funding source is. Alex stated that funding will be 80% Federal funds, 20% State funds, and that the goal is to reach consensus on an alternative relatively quickly so that the work can be completed as part of the current Shaker bridge replacement project.

One person commented that he supports the concept of a grade separated crossing (Alternative 1), but the additional cost makes it hard to justify.

A comment was made that the profile for Alternative 5 could be lowered to eliminate or reduce the concern with the undesirable crest/curve relationship.

A comment was made that the rail-trail grades on the approaches to the existing at-grade crossing at Pillsbury Street are too steep. Alternative 2 should use flatter grades with flat platforms adjacent to the roadway.

A few comments were made that Main Street should be a free flow roadway. Traffic shouldn't have to stop at an intersection as with Alternative 3 and 4.

A comment was made that raised median islands as a traffic calming measure would be difficult to plow around.

Submitted by:

John D. Butler, P.E.  
Preliminary Design Supervisor

NOTED BY: A. Vogt

cc: B. Cass                B. Oldenburg  
A. Vogt                 J. Evans  
L. Keniston            M. Dugas  
L. Suther  
Brian Lombard, Rail & Transit  
Town of Enfield

S:\(TOWNS)\Enfield\12967B\CONFRPTS\03-14-2011\_PIM.DOC

# ENFIELD 12967B MAIN STREET / RAIL TRAIL CROSSING

## EVALUATION MATRIX

March 14, 2011

ALTERNATIVE	DESCRIPTION	IMPROVED EMERGENCY & LARGE VEHICLE ACCESS	SLOWER SPEEDS SEE NOTE	OPEN VIEWS	RECREATION ACCESS TO LAKE	BETTER PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION	SAVES HISTORIC RAIL TRAIL FEATURES	ELIMINATES SAFETY & NOISE CONCERNS EXIST. UNDERPASS	SAFE RAIL TRAIL CROSSING	ESTIMATED COST \$ MILLIONS
1	Trail bridge over Main Street	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	BEST	\$1.3
2	At grade crossing, drop trail.	YES	SOME	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	\$0.4
3	At grade crossing, improve temporary crossing.	YES	YES	SOME	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	\$0.3
4	At grade crossing, "T", 4 way at Sargent Street.	YES	YES	SOME	SOME	YES	YES SOME IMPACT	YES	YES	\$0.3
5	At grade crossing, raise Main Street	YES	SOME	SOME	SOME	YES	YES	YES	YES	\$0.3
6	Do nothing, leave emergency access as is.	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	\$0.0

**NOTE: Slower Speeds on the Trail and on Main Street can be provided with various traffic calming techniques for all options.**

## MEETING ATTENDANCE

**PROJECT:** Enfield 12967B, Main Street improvements at Rail Trail Crossing

**LOCATION:** Monday, March 14, 2011, 7:00 PM at Enfield Community Bldg, Enfield

NAME	AGENCY OR ADDRESS	COMMENT
MEREDITH SMITH	80 LIVINGSTONE LODGE RD.	
DOUR SMITH	"	
Kate McMullan	31 ROSTER CIRCLE (SUMMERS)	
Robert Gill	36 MAIN ST	
MAURICE VAUDERPOT	6 Willow Ln Enfield	
THOM PEBUQUE	MAIN ST Enfield	
Timothy Taylor	80 Baltic ST, Enfield	Fire Dept Enfield
Ken Hill	1490 Rte 41A ENFIELD	
Ken Wheeler	368 USAT 4 ENFIELD	
Lloyd A. Wheeler	4 LIVINGSTONE LODGE RD.	
Margaret Clough	35 SARGENT ST. ENFIELD, N.H.	
Helen Skeist	3 Gould Rd. Canaan	

## MEETING ATTENDANCE

**PROJECT:** Enfield 12967B, Main Street improvements at Rail Trail Crossing

**LOCATION:** Monday, March 14, 2011, 7:00 PM at Enfield Community Bldg, Enfield

NAME	AGENCY OR ADDRESS	COMMENT
Teresa Lynch	94 Livingstone Lodge Rd	#2 is the most preferred plan to preserve lake shore + open views, what can be done to reverse Historic District
Tricia Barr	39 Glen Road Enfield	I support option #2 - bridge
Myra Mayman	PO Box 198, East Andover	I support #3
Alex Bernhard	PO box 198 East Andover	Support #3
John W. Klue	28 Sunrise Farm Lane, Enfield	Schatman - like #2 <sup>of part</sup> #3
Katie Beth Ryan	Valley News	
STEVE PATTEN	LIVINGSTONE LODGE RD	#2
JEAN PATTEN	Livingstone Lodge Rd	#2
JOHN CARR	WENS STREET	#3
TIM SENNING	MAY ST., ENFIELD	#2!!
Jim Taylor	Town of Enfield	
Tom L. well	10 Sawmill Lane Apr. 2011	



## MEETING ATTENDANCE

**PROJECT:** Enfield 12967B, Main Street improvements at Rail Trail Crossing

**LOCATION:** Monday, March 14, 2011, 7:00 PM at Enfield Community Bldg, Enfield

NAME	AGENCY OR ADDRESS	COMMENT
Robert Godfrey	47 Boys Camp Rd Enfield	Alt #4 is my choice
Peter Gley	BOYS CAMP RD ENFIELD	
David Beaufait	29 Maple St, Enfield	I support #2
Jason Bosse	184 Main St Enfield	I support #2
Kim Quirk	78 MAIN ST ENFIELD	I support #2; save the hotel <del>spec</del> spec
June Marshall	282 Shaker Hill Rd Enfield	#2 Save land for recreation
Nancy Smith	259 Shaker Hill Rd Enf.	#2! Save hotel land
D Mackay	FNRT - GC	<del> </del>
Joe & Cathy Gasparik	597 Rt 4A Enfield & 194 Main St	WE SUPPORT #2
Judya David Crate	58 Sargent St. Enfield, NH	#2
Daniel + Shannon Kiley	173 Shaker Hill Enfield NH	#2
Hunt Goodhart	73 IBEY RD ENFIELD	SAVE <sup>STONE</sup> BRIDGE

## MEETING ATTENDANCE

**PROJECT:** Enfield 12967B, Main Street improvements at Rail Trail Crossing

**LOCATION:** Monday, March 14, 2011, 7:00 PM at Enfield Community Bldg, Enfield

NAME	AGENCY OR ADDRESS	COMMENT
Linda Zoller-McKibbin	3 Bay Dr. Enfield NH 03748	FNRT Board member
Linda Loves	159 AS Route 4 Enfield, NH 03748	
Leslie Clancy	174 Main St Enfield, NH 03748	
Suzanne Humman	PO Box 364 Enfield 03748	Heritage Commission <sup>savings</sup> member - concern for bridge
Chuck Townsend	49 Hall Rd Canaan	
Solly Sharp	39 Cels Dyer Enfield NH 03748	#2 - save motel land!
Roger Bickford	24 Maple St Enfield NH	
EARL BRADY	24 MAY ST ENFIELD NH	
Jean Ricard	222 Lockehaven Rd " "	
DeeDee Mirell Wynn	178 Jones Hill Rd "	
Donald Wynn	POB 163 Enfield NH	
PAUL CURRIER	203 CRYSTAL LAKE RD. ENFIELD	ALT #5 IS MY CHOICE

## MEETING ATTENDANCE

**PROJECT:** Enfield 12967B, Main Street improvements at Rail Trail Crossing

**LOCATION:** Monday, March 14, 2011, 7:00 PM at Enfield Community Bldg, Enfield

NAME	AGENCY OR ADDRESS	COMMENT
Anthony E. Lozan	177 Jones Hill Rd, Enfield, NH 03748	I support Option #2 for many reasons.
Kathy Rice	148 Main St. Enfield	I support #2 SAVES hotel tax
Scott Johnston	Enfield Public Works	NEED TO ADDRESS SAFETY FOR ALL INCLUDING MAINTENANCE
Steve Schneider	1. own of Enfield	Please respect wishes of citizens of Enfield
Richard Cate Jr.	Town of Enfield Police	Support the #2 option.
Donald J. Cate Sr.	Selectman	I Support Plan #2