

DRAFT

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: June 25, 2009

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: Winchester Emergency Operations Center

ATTENDED BY:

Project Lead Team

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

Project Advisory Committee

(Absent) Bob Gray, Winchester Town Administrator
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
Clyde Keene, Westport Village Resident
(Absent) Dale Gray, Winchester Highway Superintendent
Gus Ruth, Winchester Selectman
(Absent) Herb Stephens, Winchester Emergency Management Director
(Absent) Jeremy Laplante, NH Dept of Safety, Bureau of Homeland Security &
Emergency Management
(Absent) 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
Sara Carbonneau, Swanzey Planner

DRAFT

Others

Gary Phillips, Winchester Police Chief
Daniel Carr, State Representative, Cheshire County District 4, & ARLAC
Bruce Willard, Winchester resident
Richard LaPoint, Winchester resident

SUBJECT: Project Advisory Committee Meeting #4

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

On June 25, 2009 approximately 14 people gathered at the Winchester Emergency Operations Center for a meeting facilitated by the Southwest Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC). The intent was for the PAC members to refine the screening criteria and to discuss design alternatives.

DESCRIPTION

J. B. Mack of the SWRPC welcomed everyone and asked that the committee members introduce themselves.

J. B. then asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes from the previous meeting (PAC Meeting #3). A motion to accept the minutes was raised however, it was noted that some PAC members had yet been able to acquire PAC Meeting #3 minutes, so a motion to shelve Meeting #3 minutes until the next meeting was raised and seconded, and PAC Meeting #3 minutes will be discussed at the next meeting.

Next, the screening criteria developed at PAC meeting #3 were refined. An updated criterion is attached to these minutes. The following comments and questions came up during the refinement process:

- What is the geometry of the river upstream and downstream of the bridge?
- Will a change in bridge geometry affect flood plains or cause detrimental effects on area wetlands?
- Are there flooding concerns?

Next, the PAC members used the screening criteria on a mock alternative to determine the effectiveness of the criteria. The following comments and questions came up during the presentation:

- How will funding be acquired for the creation of a parking area for recreational users of the river?
- Where will access to the river be located?
- How will funding be acquired to install a dry hydrant at the river location for the fire department?
- Where will there be access at or near the bridge for the dry hydrant?
- How will the alternatives impact the possible development of 40 to 45 houses on the hill behind Shamrock Realty?

DRAFT

- Will all the alternatives address drainage issues and icing issues north of the bridge?

Next David Scott presented the following five alternatives and two detours:

- Alternative 1: Existing Horizontal and Vertical Alignment
- Alternative 2: Existing Horizontal and Modified Vertical Alignment – raising bridge 3 feet
- Alternative 3: Existing Horizontal and Modified Vertical Alignment – raising bridge 10 feet
- Alternative 4: Modified Horizontal and Vertical Alignment – move bridge upstream
- Alternative 5: Modified Horizontal and Vertical Alignment – move bridge downstream
- Detour Alternative 1 – Upstream of Existing Bridge
- Detour Alternative 2 – Downstream of Existing Bridge

During the review of the alternatives, PAC members requested that the design team look at the following:

- A downstream alignment that would have horizontal curves located closer to the bridge
- An alignment that may not necessarily place the bridge parallel to the existing bridge
- A vertical alignment that may cut into the crest north of the bridge
- A downstream alternative that includes the bridge within a horizontal curve.

PAC members commented that they preferred options that raised the elevation of the roadway at the location of the bridge, and that if an online option was chosen a downstream detour seemed to produce the least impacts.

The design team will follow-up on the above comments and questions by doing the following before the next PAC meeting:

- Bring an aerial photo of the area showing the geometry of the river.
- Investigate left lane turning warrants for Westport Village Road.
- Investigate if a FEMA Flood Study has been performed in this area.
- Place PDFs of the alternatives discussed at this meeting on the website. PDFs of the alternatives are located on the webpage:
<http://www.nh.gov/dot/projects/winchester12906/index.htm>
- Refine design elements in the alternatives presented at PAC meeting #4.
- Create two or three distinctly new alternative that implements PAC members' suggestions.
- Determine possible locations for a dry hydrant near the bridge.
- Determine possible location for recreational access to the river.
- Develop preliminary estimates for alternatives.

DRAFT

Don mentioned that at the next meeting the committee would continue refining the screening criteria and design alternatives would be discussed. He announced that a public meeting would be scheduled after the PAC is satisfied with a set of alternatives to show to the public.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, September 10, 2009 at 5 PM at the Swanzey Town Office.

Submitted by:

Samantha D. Fifield, P.E.

SF/sf

NOTED BY: DLS, JAT, JBM, DL

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

DRAFT

Alternative Screening Criteria

Winchester-Swanzey, 12906, NH Route 10 Context Sensitive Solutions (Presented on June 25, 2009)

Access	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative provide efficient vehicular access to residences? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative provide efficient vehicular access to businesses? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative enhance access to Westport Village Road? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve pedestrian and cyclist access to the Ashuelot River for recreational purposes? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve vehicular access to the Ashuelot River for recreational purposes? (e.g. parking, river access) 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative enhance access to employment, goods, emergencies and other services in the Keene area for passenger and commercial vehicles? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative provide access to water supplies for fire control? 					
Aesthetics	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the alternative result in an aesthetically-pleasing passage in keeping with the rural character of southwest NH? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the alternative enhance views of the Ashuelot River? 					

DRAFT

(Presented on June 25, 2009)

Environment	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative preserve bank stability along the Ashuelot River? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative minimize impacts to the waters, aquifers, wetlands, and floodplains of the Ashuelot River? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative minimize impacts to the habitat of endangered, threatened, or special concern wildlife species in the Ashuelot River basin? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative minimize impacts to the habitat of endangered, threatened, or special concern plant species in the Ashuelot River basin? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative minimize impacts to unfragmented forest lands, existing farmlands, and prime agricultural soils? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative minimize impacts to potential archaeological sensitive areas? 					
Implementation	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the alternative feasible given the budget for the project? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative minimize impacts to abutting properties? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative discourage detour traffic through Westport Village Road during construction? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative provide for effective emergency vehicle and emergency evacuation passage during construction? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative provide a safe road surface for cyclists (including motorcycles) during construction? 					

DRAFT

(Presented on June 25, 2009)

Mobility	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve the mobility of passenger vehicles in southwest NH? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve the mobility of commercial vehicles in southwest NH? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve mobility of turning movements? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative provide continuous mobility at the intersection of Westport Village Road? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve the mobility of cyclists and pedestrians in southwest NH? 					
Safety	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve safety for automobiles? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve safety for commercial vehicles? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve safety for pedestrians? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve safety of turning movements? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve safety of thru traffic at the intersection of Westport Village Road? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative improve safety for cyclists (including motorcycles)? 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alternative reduce conflicts between different modes of transportation (including multi-use trail users)? 					

DRAFT

(Presented on June 25, 2009)

Overall	Unreasonable	Reasonable
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Does the alternative address the problems identified in the Problem Statement and reflect the vision outlined in the Vision Statement?		