



TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES -- UNOFFICIAL
Workshop
Wednesday, February 17, 2016
6:30 PM
Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman James Sullivan called the workshop to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL #1

In attendance: Councilors D. Winterton, T. Tsantoulis, J. Levesque, A. Jennings, M. Miville, D. Ross and Chairman Sullivan.

Missed: Councilors N. Comai and R. Duhaime

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. WORKSHOP: Lilac Bridge

Chairman Sullivan said that the purpose of the workshop was to go over the plans for removal of the Lilac Bridge and the construction of a pedestrian bridge. The process will include a presentation by the design team who will take questions from Town Councilors and representatives from the Department of Public Works, Sewer Commission, Water Precinct, Heritage Commission, Historical Society and members of the public. Town Engineer, Jim Donaldson, stated that the structural engineering firm of DuBois & King had been engaged last fall to design and oversee the project. He said a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the town, NH Department of Transportation (DOT), the Army Corps of Engineers, and the NH Division of Historic Resources (DHR). He referenced three handouts provided: 1) the presentation, 2) a project schedule, and 3) minutes of the Town Council meeting of December 17, 2014 approving the project and itemizing the total cost of \$3.3 million. Bob Durfee, Project Manager, introduced himself indicating that he was a bridge engineer by profession, Nick ??, a Water/Sewer permitting engineer, and Eric Ohanian, Project Engineer/Bridges.

Mr. Durfee said that this preliminary design meeting is intended to get the town's consensus on the options and recommendations presented and get some direction on which options to pursue. Once consensus has been reached, a final design presentation will be made to the NH Department of Transportation and the NH Division of Historic Resources.

The PowerPoint presentation addressed substructure repairs; existing superstructure demolition; new superstructure replacement alternatives, enhancements, decking type, and width; utilities; approaches and project costs. The cost of a utility/sewer bridge was also included. A copy of the presentation can be found on the town's website under Lilac Bridge.

51
52 Mr. Durfee indicated that the substructure repairs included pointing and chinking stone
53 masonry, repairing the deteriorated concrete, pier cap and abutment seat modifications to
54 support the pedestrian bridge, riprap that are large stones to prevent erosion, and
55 waterproofing for an estimated cost of \$250,000.

56
57 The estimated demolition cost of \$875,000 includes installing containment booms
58 downstream, collecting debris, obtaining environmental permits, controlling blast
59 demolition, salvage, removal, and disposal by crane/barge and maintaining the sewer
60 flows. Mr. Durfee said they do not recommend a method and leave that up to
61 contractors. The last three truss bridges removed in NH have employed the controlled
62 blast demolition. In response to Chairman Sullivan, Nick ??? said that permits would be
63 required from the NH Department of Environmental Services' Wetlands Bureau, acting on
64 behalf of the Army Corps of Engineers. Kathie Northrup, Chair of the Heritage
65 Commission, asked if the three buildings in the area (the Congregational Church,
66 Robie's, and the Water Precinct building) would be protected. Mr. Durfee said "yes, the
67 permit requires the blasting contractor to submit a blast plan and survey conditions of all
68 adjacent buildings by putting blast monitors on the buildings, and the contractor would be
69 responsible for the cost of repairing any damages caused by the blasting".

70
71 Councilor Ross asked what the benefit was of not utilizing blast demolition. Mr. Durfee
72 said removing by barge-mounted crane is the least environmentally invasive. Councilor
73 Miville indicated that he thought there was urgency about the bridge not falling in the
74 water; hence, a crane would be used so that rusty debris was not dropped in the river.
75 Mr. Durfee said there is concern about the bridge falling in the river because of the sewer
76 line which would break and cause an environmental disaster. With regard to the means
77 of demolition, Mr. Durfee said that the last three truss bridges removed from NH had no
78 restrictions on means and methods. The least cost method is the controlled blast
79 demolition. Councilor Tsantoulis said he did not see why there would be any long term
80 environmental impact. Nick ?? said they have some environmental concern related to
81 rare and endangered species and that the environmental permitting process is designed
82 to identify impacts and mitigate against them. Divers have indicated that large boulders
83 are not going to be disturbed if the bridge were to fall in. Councilor Tsantoulis confirmed
84 that the impacts would be minimal and of short duration, and if dropping the bridge in the
85 river is the most cost effective, he's OK with that. Todd Smith from the Water Precinct
86 asked what the cost difference was to demolition options. Eric Ohanian said that was
87 difficult to answer because "you don't see many bridges like this" and they try not to
88 restrict a contractor on its means and methods. The DuBois & King price of \$875,000
89 was developed by pricing out barges, cranes, mobilizing crews and labor days
90 anticipated. If the contractor can use blast demolition to save money, then it's possible
91 the \$875,000 could be reduced.

92
93 The next slide proposed two demolition areas approximately 1800 feet upstream from the
94 bridge. The contractor will need to utilize the boat launch. The contractor will need
95 another mobilization area closer to the bridge to erect the new truss bridge when it
96 arrives. The new bridge is expected to come in nine pieces to be bolted together. The
97 contractor will be required to fence off the Veterans Park area. Councilor Ross asked if
98 the boat ramp was suitable. Mr. Durfee said it was adequate and the contractor will be
99 required to provide a performance bond to cover any damage done to the boat launch.

100

101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149

Councilor Winterton asked if the 1800+ feet mobilization area was normal. Mr. Durfee said having a boat ramp is a good thing. The contractor will probably be looking to build his own ramp along Merrimack Street and there will be environmental damage and will require a permit.

Mr. Durfee proposed two pedestrian bridge alternatives. The Pony Truss, the lesser cost alternative (\$1,400,000) provides easier utility access and the concrete deck could be timber. It also has a more open appearance but it is not similar to the existing bridge in appearance. The Pony Truss depicted on the slide is on Gold Street in Laconia and was built about 12 years ago. The Through Truss (\$1,550,000) includes bracings at the top which is similar to the existing truss in appearance but can feel constricting for long spans. The Through Truss more closely matches the existing bridge aesthetically which is a concern of the Historic Commission. The MOU provides that DHR have input on “viewscales” or on what the bridge looks like. Both cost estimates assume painted steel, concrete deck and 12-ft width. Councilor Winterton asked if input from DHR was accompanied with a check. Mr. Durfee said “just input”.

Sid Baines of the Sewer Commission asked if the Historical Society has said no to the Pony Truss. Mr. Durfee said they have received no official input or comment from the DHR or the Hooksett Historical Society on a preferred truss type. Kathie Northrup for the Heritage Commission said they would prefer the Through Truss.

Councilor Ross pointed out that the necessary arch is less on the Through Truss than the Pony Truss, and suggested the Council take into consideration that the Through Truss is more stable. Mr. Durfee said that either structure would be adequate to support utilities. Councilor Ross prefers the Through Truss for its structural integrity and the fact that it does mimic the bridge currently there. Councilor Ross said he is strongly in favor of the Through Truss.

Councilor Miville asked if the width of the trusses were the same. Mr. Durfee said the Pony Truss on the left of the slide was 8 feet and the Through Truss on the right was 10.9 inches but both could be any width. Councilor Miville said there was a Pony Truss in Manchester’s West Side going into Goffstown/Pinardville and suggested residents visit.

Mr. Durfee said they reviewed three other alternatives that were not considered because they were not cost effective. He then went over the pros and cons of three coating options: weathering steel, galvanizing, and paint. Weathering steel is the least expensive but is difficult to clean and has a rusty appearance. Galvanizing is the most expensive and requires low maintenance but is visually unattractive. Three-coat painting was the recommended coating providing 40-year protection and is visually attractive. In response to Councilor Miville, Mr. Durfee said that any color could be possible. Councilor Ross noted that the current coating is weathering steel and suggested that re-painting would be an expensive endeavor. Mr. Durfee said it would be costly but they no longer use sand blasting; they use power washing and it is totally contained to keep from failing in the water. Councilor Ross said he’d be inclined to go with the weathering steel. Mr. Durfee said they would have no concern if the town choosing to go that route.

150 Mr. Durfee went over decking options of timber or concrete. The recommendation is for
151 concrete decking even though it is more expensive than timber. Concrete decking is
152 durable (50-year service life/some last 100 years), requires little maintenance, and is
153 adaptable to multi-purpose use. Timber decking is lower cost and planks can be more
154 easily removed to reach utilities but it must be replaced every 15-20 years and is high
155 maintenance.

156
157 Councilor Ross mentioned that wood can be replaced more easily than concrete.
158 Councilor Winterton asked if wood decking could withstand 6 inches of snow and a
159 snowmobile running across it. Mr. Durfee said snow removal on the bridge could cause
160 plow damage and the area can get 60 or 70 pounds of snow which is a lesser load than
161 pedestrians going over the bridge in the summer. Mr. Durfee urged the Council to think
162 through the use of the bridge because it will last 100 years. Chairman Sullivan asked
163 about service trucks. Mr. Durfee said these bridges are typically able to withstand five
164 ton maintenance vehicles.

165
166 Mr. Durfee said they are recommending a concrete deck mainly for durability and long
167 term maintenance costs and adaptability for any future use. Councilor Ross confirmed
168 that the wood deck could withstand the same vehicles as the concrete decking and said
169 the town has lived without a concrete bridge for many years. He'd like to keep the costs
170 down and prefers a timber decking. In addition, wood would maintain the bridge's
171 historical integrity and provide easier accessibility to the utilities on the side.

172
173 Sid Baines of the Sewer Commission stated that he would prefer concrete decking to
174 better protect pipes underneath the bridge. Councilor Ross said access to the utilities for
175 maintenance would be easier with timber decking. In response to Councilor Miville, Mr.
176 Durfee said the timber planks would be 4x8, 4x10 or 4x12.

177
178 Discussion then entailed bridge width of 10 feet (minimum) or 12 feet, the maximum
179 reasonable width. Mr. Durfee recommended the 12 foot width that would be adequate for
180 bicycle, pedestrian and snowmobile traffic and has no maintenance vehicle restrictions.
181 It was mentioned that security fencing is not required and the options of placing the
182 utilities below the bridge or on the sides was discussed. The engineers recommended
183 that utilities be placed below the bridge because it was lowest cost, standard practice,
184 was aesthetically pleasing and protects utilities for weather and vandalism. Utilities on
185 the sides of the bridge would be more expensive, would provide a different appearance
186 than the existing historic structure, and exposed to weather and vandalism (jumping
187 platform).

188
189 Two alternatives were provided on security fencing which is not required. One option had
190 fencing on the top which would prevent climbing and diving. Cost for fencing adds
191 \$25,000 and aesthetic treatment can be applied. Kathie Northrup thought it was a state
192 requirement to have fencing. Mr. Durfee said it is a town owned bridge so the town has
193 the option to not put fencing on the bridge. Public Works Director, Diane Boyce, asked
194 about the height of the rails. Mr. Durfee said kids use the rails as ladder steps; a chain
195 linked fence is more difficult to get a foot hold in. Mr. Durfee said the sewer lines would
196 be replaced on this bridge and water would have a secondary line. Utilities can be
197 mounted below the bridge or on the sides of the bridge. In either case, they would be
198 installed symmetrically to balance out the load.

199

200 Bruce Kudrick, Sewer Superintendent, prefers side visibility because the utilities can be
201 seen all of the time. If they are hidden underneath, people forget about it until something
202 fails. Mr. Kudrick also feels that a security fence will be necessary if the utilities are on
203 the outside. It must be looked at so that the utilities are protected. The pipe now is steel
204 and the one going in will not have the same strength as steel. Nick ??? said it would be a
205 high density plastic that could be subject to vandalism but it could provide flexibility that
206 steel won't. There are pros and cons to either and the types of damages that could be
207 done. Chairman Sullivan asked if pipes on the side would be lower than the pipes
208 underneath the bridge. Mr. Durfee said they would be higher. Councilor Winterton asked
209 about Mr. Kudrick's concern. Mr. Kudrick said it is difficult to see if there is rotting if the
210 pipes are underneath. Councilor Winterton asked if inspection couldn't be made from a
211 boat. Mr. Kudrick said that is possible. It's maintenance that has to be set up and "we
212 need to determine how that will be handled in the future". Chairman Sullivan confirmed
213 that a concrete deck would protect pipes from getting weathering affect. The Chairman
214 asked if the Water Precinct concurred with Superintendent Kudrick. Mike Hideler said he
215 agrees with Mr. Kudrick that placing the utility lines on the sides would make it easier to
216 watch and maintain. One idea that's been discussed is the possibility of including a pipe
217 bench on the inside which would provide easy access and reduce the cost of mounting.
218 Mr. Durfee said it is possible but "you'd have to use concrete because timber would trap
219 moisture, and you'd be adding four feet – 20 inches for each pipe which would bring the
220 price up". Mr. Durfee said placing the utilities on the sides of the bridge would add
221 \$130,000 to the costs and that is why they recommend that utilities be installed below the
222 bridge.

223
224 Rick ??? said the costs are significantly higher than expected and asked for a break
225 down. Nick ??? said they made some assumptions on connection costs and estimated
226 that water is available within 25 feet of the bridge. A breakdown of costs will be provided
227 separately. Chairman Sullivan referenced the December 17, 2014 minutes that listed the
228 source of funds and amounts totaling \$3.3 million. The total did not include funds from
229 the Water Precinct.

230
231 Councilor Levesque asked for the height of the girder which is five feet and wondered
232 what the costs might be for including a catwalk along the length of the bridge. Mr. Durfee
233 said they had thought about that and a catwalk could be put down the middle. It would
234 add costs but it wouldn't have enough pipe clearance for someone to walk down the
235 catwalk and you'd get into the flood stage elevation. One would have to crawl down it
236 and that would be considered a confined space entry so staff would have to get confined
237 space training.

238
239 **[Councilor Adam left at 8:07 p.m.]**

240
241 Mr. Durfee said the bridge must be connected to existing sidewalks or roads. Approach
242 work includes clearing all the vegetation at each abutment, asphalt path, fencing, loaming
243 and seeding, and an option for lighting on the approaches and on the bridge. The total
244 cost is \$35,000 and another \$75,000 to add lighting. The total project cost is \$3.7 million.

245
246 Estimated cost for a sewer bridge that could support water as well totaled \$1.8 million.
247 Mr. Durfee said the next meeting would be a public outreach meeting with date to be
248 determined but they would like to hold this meeting in two weeks. That meeting could be

249 here or at the Department of Transportation. Mr. Durfee said the presentation along with
250 historic information and studies are available on the town's website.
251
252 Mr. Baines asked if the NH DHR could reject the Council's decision. Mr. Durfee said he
253 believed they could; he has experience with dealing with historic structure and they have
254 influence on decision-making. Chairman Sullivan confirmed that they have concurred
255 with the bridge being demolished. Mr. Durfee said they have indicated their concerns
256 from the viewscapes (Pinnacle). Kathie Northrup said she believed that DHR's role is
257 included in the MOU. Mr. Durfee said DHR will review the viewscapes of the proposed
258 bridge.
259
260 Councilor Tsantoulis asked if DHR would have a say on where the utilities will be placed.
261 Mr. Durfee said his experience with DHR was on historical significance and will provide
262 input on utility placement. Chairman Sullivan said at the Council's next meeting, they will
263 provide their preference on the seven issues reviewed tonight. Jim Donaldson
264 mentioned that the public hearing will likely be held at the DOT during business hours.
265
266 Councilor Winterton referred back to the "existing superstructure demolition" slide and
267 asked if the cost of maintaining the sewer flows was included in the \$875,000. Mr.
268 Durfee said yes and indicated that there are several options the contractor may take in
269 maintaining the sewer. Nick ??? said that during demolition the sewer does not stop
270 running and the contractor will determine the costs to keep the sewer going where it
271 needs to go. The consultants don't want to dictate how the contractor may choose to
272 handle the sewer so the methods used will be determined by the contractor. Councilor
273 Winterton asked if the consultants were comfortable with the \$875,000 to include
274 demolition, bonding, boat ramp and cleaning up the bridge that use to be there. Mr.
275 Durfee said yes.
276
277 Kathie Northrup asked if there would be public input prior to the Council's next meeting.
278 Chairman Sullivan said that would be possible. Mr. Durfee said the purpose of this
279 meeting is the only opportunity for the Heritage Commission, Historical Society, Water
280 Precinct and Sewer Commission to give input and give them preferred options or
281 concerns. That is the intent of this meeting. Mr. Durfee stressed the need for specific
282 recommendations from the aforementioned groups. Chairman Sullivan said by next
283 Wednesday, February 24th, a recommended approach will be made available to the
284 consultants.
285
286 Kathie Northrup asked for a sketch or drawing and said she misunderstood the purpose
287 of tonight's meeting. Mr. Durfee repeated that tonight's meeting was a preliminary design
288 presentation. Their intention was to leave tonight with decisions on all these options
289 made because at the next meeting recommended options will be presented to the state.
290
291 Chairman Sullivan asked that all input from the Commissions and the Precinct be
292 provided to the Council by February 24th. The meeting on the 24th will begin at 6:00 p.m.
293 (rather than 6:30 p.m.) to include 30 minutes for public input. It is hoped that a meeting
294 can be scheduled with the state for the week of March 7th.
295
296 Councilor Levesque said that year's ago the bridge could be used as a park with tables
297 and chairs and that should be taken into consideration.
298

299 Councilor Miville felt the Garden Club would want to weigh in and suggested that the
300 DOT be invited to meet here rather than Concord. Dr. Shankle will make the request.

301
302 Councilor Ross asked if there had been a salvage offer. Mr. Durfee said that was a
303 separate process that is ongoing. They hope to advertise the bridge for sale next week
304 and schedule bids on March 22nd. Mr. Durfee said their plan is to get that process out of
305 the way so that by March 22nd they'll know if there is a valid offer and how to design the
306 new bridge. If there is no interest, "we'll move forward to demolish". Councilor Miville
307 asked about preserving a piece of the bridge. Mr. Durfee said the MOU requires the
308 town to conduct an outreach/education program suggesting an historic story board or
309 plaque be placed on the bridge or included in the park.

310
311 Chairman Sullivan asked that Dr. Shankle send a formal invitation to the Precinct and
312 Commissions to provide their input at 6:00 p.m. at the Council's next meeting on
313 February 24th. Following public input, the Council will decide on the town's preferred
314 approach.

315
316 The Water Precinct will provide a contribution to the project but the final amount has not
317 yet been determined. The amount will be provided at next week's meeting.

318
319 **V. ADJOURNMENT**

320
321 Councilor Winterton moved, second by Councilor Ross, to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m.
322 Motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

323
324
325
326 Respectfully Submitted

327
328 Suzanne Beauchesne
329 Recording Clerk