

**TOWN OF NEW HAMPTON
JOINT MEETING WITH
TOWN OF BRISTOL
CENTRAL STREET BRIDGE PROJECT
MEETING MINUTES
NEW HAMPTON TOWN OFFICE, 6 PINNACLE HILL ROAD
November 30, 2005**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Smith called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Town of New Hampton: Mr. Smith, Mr. Salmon, Mr. Tierney; Town of Bristol: Ms. Duncan, Mr. VanDerven,

OTHERS PRESENT

Mrs. Lucas, Mr. Veloski, Mr. Barry, NH Dept. of Transportation, SEA: Mr. Marshall, Mr. Brown, SEA Consultant.

**CENTRAL STREET
BRIDGE PROJECT**

The Boards reviewed the three alternatives that SEA and the Board s have discussed in the past.

SEA reviewed the following items of concern with the Boards:

1. Material Costs
2. Roadway Alignment
3. Alignment of the Abutment

It was noted that Alternative A was originally recommended to the Boards back in 2003. Mr. Brown pointed out that there are some improvements to Alternative A, particularly in the area of roadway alignment. Mr. Brown advised that there will be some tweaking recommended during the design phase.

With regard to Alternative A, it is noted that this option maintains the same alignment as the existing road. Mr. Brown points out that alternatives B and C have a constant grade on them and the alignment is shifted slightly. The shift of the new bridge would be 15 to 20 feet difference from the old bridge. Mr. Brown advised that this is a free standing single span bridge. Mr. Brown advised that the bridge would be 36 ½ feet wide and a two lane bridge. There would be two 12 travel lanes, a six foot sidewalk and a two foot curbs. He stated that all alternatives will have this layout.

Mr. Brown advised that alternative B is a 180 steel span with a canalever concrete abutment.

Mr. Brown advised that Alternative C has a 240 steel plate girder. The recommendation from SEA is for a 10 foot deep girder.

The Boards reviewed an exaggerated bridge profile depicting all three alternatives in different colored paths.

The Board discussed the flood line on the bridge and expressed concern about damage to the bridge due to floods.

Mr. Brown stated that the bridge will be 240 from abutment to top of the bridge. He stated that if more height is added, it adds to the cost of the bridge.

With regard to questions about flooding, Mr. Brown advised that SEA is recommending going with a higher bridge and shallower girders.

The Board is reviewing various styles of bridge designs and the costs for each style as well as the cost of materials.

It was noted that each of the alternatives will have property impact in the form of permanent easements to extend a small amount on private property. It was stated that this is not a big concern, but it is important to the early phases of the project. SEA recommended that the Boards meet with the affected property owners.

The Boards raised the concern as to the height of the abutments and the safety of maintaining them, particularly out in the middle of the river.

The Board discussed the costs and advantages of raising the road on one end and the advantages and cost differences between Alternative A and B.

Mrs. Lucas raised the issue as to the amount of impact there will be to abutting property owners.

The Board discussed with SEA the particulars of the rights of way connected with the bridge.

The Board discussed holding the Public Hearing on the bridge earlier and talking to the appraiser earlier, as well as the possibility of taking the land needed by eminent domain.

The Boards expressed concerns relative to the retaining wall and the abutments.

The Boards reviewed the various materials used in each style and the prices for these materials. The prevailing thought is that the lighter the material the better. It is suggested that the Board consult with individual contractors when considering bridge design.

The Boards expressed concern relative to the weight going across the top of the bridge.

The Boards expressed concern and inquired if a bridge of this particular design has been built before or if the New Hampton bridge be the first of its kind in the State.

SEA stated that if the Boards want to put concrete all the way across the river, it will be very expensive.

It was noted that the Bristol Board will meet tomorrow night and discuss any differences or concerns they have about the presentation this evening.

The New Hampton Board expressed its desire to have a traditional design. It was noted that the townspeople would understand a traditional design better than the concrete and steel design.

The Boards advised that they are looking at comparison of costs between the alternatives presented this evening.

It was noted that the designs are very similar and the cost will come from the experience of the contractors hired to do the job.

It was noted that the project is big enough to draw interest from contractor both distant and local.

The Boards discussed the longevity of the design they choose.

The Boards discussed the approach to the bridge on both sides and how to make the parking lot on the Bristol side and the driveway on the New Hampton side accessible after construction.

The Boards is discussed the possibility of the bridge being used for suicide attempts and how to protect against it. It is suggested that a snow fence be installed for this purpose.

The Boards discussed the costs and how to present this to the voters.

The Board discussed the best way to anchor the bridge in the middle of the river and the proper materials to use. The Boards discussed the steel beams being used for the bridge and the way the beams will be hung. The Boards feel that the voters will be driven by the cost of the bridge and not the design.

The Boards are very concerned that the bridge design they are discussing hasn't been attempted in the state before and they are not sure they can find a contractor that can do this design.

Mrs. Lucas expressed concern that NHDOT will review this design, but if there has not been any experience constructing this design this could be a problem.

It was noted that the only difference in the costs of the three alternatives is in the contingency fund.

The Boards discussed costs and the proposed height of the bridge for the remainder of the meeting.

At 7:50 p.m. it was the consensus of the Boards that the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen A. Bownes
Board Works