

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

CONFERENCE REPORT

PROJECT: Winchester, 12906
DPR-BRF-X-0111 (005)
NH Rte 10 over Ashuelot River
Br. No. 152/181

DATE OF CONFERENCE: September 29, 2009

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: Winchester Town Hall

ATTENDED BY:

Project Lead Team

(Absent) J. B. Mack – Southwest Regional Planning Commission
Neel Patel – Southwest Regional Planning Commission
Donald Lyford – NHDOT Project Manager (PAC Member)
Michael Dugas – NHDOT Highway Design Preliminary Design Chief
(Absent) David Scott – NHDOT Bridge Design In-House Design Chief
Jason Tremblay – NHDOT Bridge Design Senior Project Engineer
(Absent) Laurel Kenna – NHDOT Environmental Coordinator (PAC Member)

Project Advisory Committee

Bob Gray, Winchester Town Administrator
(Absent) Bruce Bohannon, Swanzey Emergency Management Director
(Absent) Bruce Tatro, Swanzey Selectman
(Absent) Carol Keene, Westport Village Resident
(Absent) Cindy Richard, NH Dept of Safety, Bureau of Homeland Security & Emergency Management
(Absent) Clyde Keene, Westport Village Resident
(Absent) Dale Gray, Winchester Highway Superintendent
Gus Ruth, Winchester Selectman
Herb Stephens, Winchester Emergency Management Director
John Gomarlo, Town of Winchester, SWRPC Board of Directors
(Absent) Lee Dunham, Swanzey Public Works Director
(Absent) Nancy St. Laurent, NH Department of Safety, Bureau of Homeland Security & Emergency Management
(Absent) Norman Skantze, Swanzey Fire Chief
(Absent) Richard Busick, Swanzey Police
(Absent) Sara Carbonneau, Swanzey Planner

Others

Gary Phillips, Winchester Police Chief

Sherman Tedford, Winchester Selectman
Kenneth S. Gardener, Winchester Selectman
Dick LaPoint, Emergency Management

SUBJECT: Project Advisory Committee Meeting #5 (continuation of September 10, 2009 meeting held at Swanzey Town Hall)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

On September 29, 2009 approximately 12 people gathered at the Winchester Town Hall for a meeting facilitated by the Southwest Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC). The intent was for the PAC members to finalize the screening criteria and to discuss design alternatives.

DESCRIPTION

Neel Patel of the SWRPC welcomed everyone and asked that the committee members introduce themselves.

Neel asked if anyone had a chance to review the minutes from PAC Meeting #3 and PAC meeting #4. The PAC members did not recall receiving the minutes and therefore the minutes were not reviewed.

Similarly, the screening criteria had not been received and reviewed. J. B. Mack will try and hold a short PAC business meeting prior to the public meeting on November 9th.

Mike Dugas then discussed project alternatives. The first five were a review from the previous meeting held on June 25, 2009, and the final four were developed based on input from the PAC at that meeting.

- Alternative 1: Utilizes the existing horizontal and vertical alignment but does not provide adequate sight distance to the south for the crest curve at the posted speed of 50 mph. Mike explained that this alternative is not acceptable to NHDOT.
- Alternative 2: Utilizes the existing horizontal alignment but raises the vertical alignment at the bridge by 3' and cuts approximately 8' at the rail/trail crossing, to the south of the intersection. M. Dugas mentioned that the grade differential would pose traffic control challenges during construction.
- Alternative 3: Utilizes the existing horizontal alignment but raises the vertical alignment at the bridge by 10' but closely matches the grade at the rail/trail crossing.

The first three alternatives keep NH Route 10 on the existing alignment, so a detour will be required during construction. Mike Dugas next presented an upstream and a downstream detour alignment, both of which are designed for 40 mph.

Mike then discussed other alignments that maintain the existing bridge for traffic during construction.

- Alternative 4: Builds new bridge, and NH Route 10, upstream of the existing bridge. This requires a relatively long scope of roadwork and would require the acquisition of Shamrock Realty. It lowers the grade at the trail by 5' below the existing grade.
- Alternative 5: Builds new bridge, and NH Route 10, downstream of the existing bridge. This requires a relatively long scope of roadwork and would require the acquisition of four buildings. It raises the grade at the bridge by 5'.

- Alternative 6: Builds new bridge downstream of the existing and places it at a skew to the existing bridge. It raises the grade at the bridge by approximately 10'. Although, this entirely curved alignment alternative keeps NH Route 10 from going through any buildings, the house immediately SW of the bridge (parcel 12) would be acquired due to the proximity of the road to the house.
- Alternative 7: This alternative is similar to alternative 6, but would closely match the grade at the trail crossing. It builds the new bridge approximately 8' higher than the current bridge. This alternative will also require the acquisition of the house immediately SW of the bridge (parcel 12).
- Alternative 8: Proposed bridge is skewed in relation to the existing alignment to minimize property impacts. It requires the acquisition of the house immediately SW of the bridge (parcel 12) and lowers the grade at the trail by 4'.
- Alternative 9: Alternative is similar to Alternatives 6 and 7 but has reversing curvature so that the proposed roadway ties into the existing roadway in the shortest possible distance. M. Dugas does not believe this alternative will require superelevation (banking). Proposed bridge is 10' higher than the existing bridge.

All of the alternatives are good for 50 mph, except for alternative 1. All the options will require some ROW acquisition. All of the alternatives enhance drainage and remove trees, which will allow for more sunlight to melt winter snow.

A PAC member asked about wells on the project. Impacted wells will be replaced as required. It was mentioned that there is a monitoring well on the NW quadrant of the bridge. NHDOT will verify this monitoring well.

The issue of a dry hydrant came up and was discussed. Jason will try to contact the fire chiefs from Winchester and Swanzey again to get information on the pumping capacity of their pump trucks to see if a dry hydrant is feasible in this area.

M. Dugas discussed estimated costs for construction and detours, but not right-of-way (ROW) acquisition. Alternative 1 is \$4.9 million. All others range from \$5.6 million to \$7.0 million, with Alternative 4 being the most expensive. Alternative 9 is estimated at \$5.8 million.

All alternatives are to be posted on the project website.

PAC members thought that all the options should be shown at the Public Officials/Public Informational (PO/PI) meeting being held on November 9th. PAC members thought that no additional meetings between now and the PO/PI would be needed. They thought that the 9 alternatives covered all possibilities, complimented Mike on how he presented the alternatives and that he present them the same way at the PO/PI.

The next PAC meeting to screen the alternatives has not yet been scheduled although possible dates in December were discussed.

Submitted by:

Jason A. Tremblay, P.E.

JT/jt

NOTED BY: M. Dugas, D. Lyford

cc: D. Lyford

D. Scott

J. Tremblay

L. Kenna

Bill Cass, Director of Project Development

D. Graham - District 4

J.B. Mack – SWRPC

PAC Members