



*Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.*

Kilton Road  
Six Bedford Farms, Suite 607  
Bedford, New Hampshire 03110-6532  
603 644-0888  
FAX 603 644-2385

**Meeting  
Notes**

Attendees: Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT  
Marc Laurin, NHDOT  
Mike Dugas, NHDOT  
Bill O'Donnell, FHWA  
Frank O'Callaghan, VHB  
Peter Walker, VHB  
Steve Lawe, RSG  
Members of the Public (See Attached List)

Date/Time: November 12, 2003  
7:00 PM

Project No.: 51425

Place: Dover City Hall

Re: Newington to Dover EIS  
NHS-027-1(37)/11238  
Public Informational  
Meeting

Notes taken by: Peter Walker

---

At 7:00 Chris Waszczuk, Project Manager for the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT), called the meeting to order. He introduced Frank O'Callaghan and Pete Walker from VHB, and Steve Lawe from RSG as members of the consultant team who would assist the Department in the evening's presentation. Chris also introduced Bill O'Donnell from FHWA and suggested to attendees that they could contact either Bill or him after the meeting to follow-up on any project related issues (a meeting agenda with contact information was distributed). He also suggested that the project website, [www.newington-dover.com](http://www.newington-dover.com), was an excellent means of staying informed and offering comments.

Chris then reviewed the agenda and purpose of the public informational meeting which included a review of the project's scope and study area, a review of existing study area traffic conditions and environmental resources, and review of the project's purpose and need. He noted that a Scoping Report was being prepared to summarize these items and would document Phase 1 of the project's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He then stated the primary purpose of the project is to improve transportation efficiency and to reduce safety problems for an approximately 3.5 mile long section of the Spaulding Turnpike beginning at the Gosling Road Interchange in Newington and extending across the Little Bay Bridges to the toll facility in Dover. He noted that the purpose and need statement is an important document within the EIS since it identifies why the proposed action is being pursued. It is also particularly important for those unfamiliar with the project and the study area. Chris then reviewed the project need citing the importance of the Spaulding Turnpike from commuter, commerce, and tourist perspectives; its designation as part of the National Highway System (NHS); and its function as a limited access highway linking the seacoast region with I-95, Concord, the Lakes Region and the White Mountains. He cited the historic growth of traffic and future projections, the poor levels of traffic service, existing geometric constraints and deficiencies and the history of traffic accident experience. Chris also

noted that the Turnpike bisects local residential, recreational and commercial areas, and that there exists a need for local connectivity of motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists. He stated that the Little Bay Bridges were major structures located on an important highway in a moderate seismic area and not designed to meet the current seismic criteria for this region. He concluded by noting that the Newington-Dover Spaulding Turnpike project was included in the State's Ten-Year Transportation Improvement Program and was the highest long-term transportation priority of the Seacoast Metropolitan Planning Organization. He noted that as the area continues to develop and future traffic volumes increase, traffic operations and safety conditions would worsen. Chris then asked Frank O'Callaghan to review the project background.

Frank began by describing the project study area as extending north from Exit 1 (Gosling Road/Pease Boulevard) of the Turnpike on the south, traversing the Little Bay Bridges to a point just south of the Dover Toll Plaza, and bounded by the Piscataqua River on the east and Little Bay on the west. He noted many study area issues such as marine habitat, navigation, water quality, tidal and surface wetlands, park and recreational activities, historic and cultural resources and potential residential and commercial property impacts. He cited previous studies – NH 16 Corridor Management Study (1998) and the Spaulding Turnpike, Newington-Dover Feasibility Study (2000) – which identified poor traffic operating conditions for the study area under current and future traffic volume conditions. Frank noted that current weekday peak hour capacity constraints extended from Exit 6 southbound to Exit 3 (Woodbury Avenue) in the morning, and from Exit 4N northbound through Exit 6 in the evening. These capacity conditions are compounded by a number of geometric deficiencies including substandard shoulder width on the Little Bay Bridges, substandard turning radii at many of the interchange on and off ramps, and inadequate weaving distances in both the northbound (River Road) and southbound (Nimble Hill Road) Exit 4N - Exit 4 area. He also noted that US 4 was capacity constrained during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Study area traffic accidents during the 1997-2001 period (908 total) increased by approximately 58 percent in comparison to the previous 5-year, 1992-1996, period (575 total). During the 1997-2001 period, accidents increased at approximately 11 percent per year in comparison to the average annual traffic volume growth of 3 percent per year. The Little Bay Bridges are the highest accident location in the study area. Frank concluded his remarks on traffic operations and safety by referring to an interim safety improvement plan that has been developed to improve traffic and safety conditions in the Exit 4 – Exit 4N, Nimble Hill Road and River Road area. The plan has been endorsed by Newington officials and is scheduled for implementation in 2005.

Frank O'Callaghan then presented some preliminary bridge findings by contrasting the Little Bay Bridges with the General Sullivan Bridge. The Little Bay Bridges are characterized by substandard shoulder widths and a 3.5 percent grade which limits driver sight distance to a 60 mph design speed (design speed being the maximum safe operating speed governed by the vertical alignment or profile). The 2-lane bridges have minor deterioration and the substructure for both bridges – composed of reinforced concrete – was designed and constructed in 1966 prior to seismic resistance requirements.

Frank then enumerated several factors which would affect the rehabilitation alternatives for the General Sullivan Bridge. A 4 percent grade limits driver sight distance to a 45 mph design speed. The cross-section is limited to 24' of pavement and 2'-11" sidewalks on each side. These geometric characteristics and the continuous truss nature of the structure will preclude the rehabilitation and reuse of the bridge to function as two freeway/turnpike lanes to complement the function and operation of the Little Bay Bridges and Turnpike. In addition, the deck, girders and truss members exhibit major deterioration, and there is extensive substructure deterioration. He noted that the piers are composed of unreinforced granite block and mortar, and in conjunction with the low internal redundancy of the truss design and the fatigue associated with

the age (1935 construction) of the structure, the General Sullivan Bridge is more vulnerable to a seismic event than the Little Bay Bridges. The General Sullivan Bridge is also historic and subject to costly lead paint removal and re-painting. Frank noted that the Kimball Chase 1991 inspection and evaluation of the bridge estimated rehabilitation costs ranging from \$8 million to \$16 million depending on the nature and extent of pier reconstruction or replacement. These 1991 cost estimates would be \$12 - \$20 million in 2003 dollars, and may underestimate the cost of painting. For example, the I-95 Piscataqua River Bridge was recently re-painted for approximately \$11.8 million. He concluded by reiterating the infeasibility of rehabilitating the General Sullivan Bridge to function as a Turnpike-like facility to complement the Little Bay Bridges.

Frank then introduced Steve Lawe who summarized the process to update the seacoast regional traffic model, the purpose of which is to estimate how future traffic patterns are impacted by land use and transportation policy alternatives, and to enhance the overall understanding of the transportation planning process. He identified data requirements such as seasonal and year round housing; auto ownership and household size; employment; roadway network characteristics such as functional classification, number of lanes, capacity, speeds, and intersection controls; transit routing and costs; tolls and auto costs; travel patterns, such as trip generation, length of trips, mode choice, and choice of travel route; traffic counts; transit ridership; and the 1992 seacoast household survey. Steve touched on the sensitivity of the model with respect to infrastructure improvements and changes in land use, and noted that increases in capacity may attract new vehicle trips and that increases in vehicle cost may decrease vehicle trips. The results or output of the travel demand model include: roadway volumes and delays, transit ridership, shifts in travel patterns and shifts in land use patterns consistent with the testing of transportation system improvement alternatives.

Steve concluded by summarizing the purpose, methodology and results of the 2003 Seacoast Travel Survey. He explained that the survey format was a series of computer-based dynamic questions whereby respondents "state" their preferences given a series of options, and that answers to a question are input to the next question. The survey was designed to estimate Seacoast residents' sensitivity to different transportation mode alternatives, and to assist in developing recommendations on how to improve transportation in the seacoast area. The survey was administered in June 2003 and included 1,537 respondents, approximately 50 percent higher than the 1,000 target response. The survey was computer-internet based with flyers containing the internet web address distributed at many public (toll booths, local transportation centers, city/town halls) areas and at local businesses and colleges. Steve summarized some of the survey findings: 74 percent of respondents were full time seacoast area residents; travel to/from work (60 percent) and work related business (13 percent) were the most prevalent trip purposes; 78 percent of travelers drove alone; 19 percent shared a ride; and of those who chose not to use a car, cost, congestion and preference for transit were cited as reasons for not driving. The Rockingham and Strafford regional planning commission are currently reviewing a draft summary report.

Peter Walker then provided an overview of environmental issues associated with the project. He briefly reviewed the project Study Area, and reminded the audience that the project is in the first phase of the EIS process. Perhaps the most obvious and significant feature of the study area is the Little Bay/Great Bay estuary, one of the largest estuarine environments on the east coast. The study area contains a number of natural resources including tidal and freshwater wetlands, wildlife habitat, rare species habitats and floodplains. VHB is consulting with the University of New Hampshire to conduct an inventory of subtidal (submerged) habitats.

Mr. Walker briefly reviewed the approach being taken to study potential air quality effects, noting that reduction in congestion would typically have a net positive effect on regional air quality. Noise impacts from the highway have been a concern expressed frequently during previous project meetings. He presented a summary of the noise study, showing a figure which depicts 14

noise sensitive areas determined to be present in the study area. A detailed noise model will be created that will help determine where noise mitigation measures might be necessary.

Mr. Walker briefly summarized the recreational and historical resources at Hilton Park on Dover Point. Because the project must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Department must consider impacts to historic structures and archeological resources. The interested public is invited to participate in consultations on this subject among the NHDOT, the FHWA and the NH Division of Historical Resources. If residents own a historic property that may be affected, or if they belong to an organization concerned with historical resources, they may contact Mr. Harry Kinter of the FHWA to learn more about how they can become a consulting party.

Socio-economic effects will also be addressed in the EIS. Socio-economic effects can be direct - for example, property owners may be impacted if an expanded highway requires acquisition of new right-of-way. Effects can also be indirect and cumulative. For example, by changing the operation of the regional transportation network, patterns of residential and business development may change, which could have an effect on regional patterns of population growth. Pete Walker explained that the socio-economic study area would include more than just the Dover and Newington areas for purposes of analyzing these larger trends. A total of 32 communities, including portions of Carroll, Strafford, and Rockingham Counties would be included in the analysis.

Because of the limited time available for the evening's meeting, Mr. Walker could not touch in detail on all of the issues that will be analyzed in the EIS. However, he indicated that several other issues in addition to those already discussed would be considered. The list of issues includes: navigation, floodplains, aesthetic resources, aquifers and public water supplies, and potential hazardous contamination sites.

Frank O'Callaghan then summarized the reasonable range of alternatives, in addition to the No-Build alternative, that will be considered: Transportation System Management (TSM) improvements, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, Upgrading the Corridor, and a combination of the above. He noted that at this point in the study, conceptual improvement alternatives have not been developed; rather, concepts will be developed from this range of alternatives and screened for feasibility in the next phase of the study. He went on to state that the No Build alternative perpetuates the existing transportation system, is the base case for comparing system improvement alternatives, and is required by the federal environmental review process. TSM improvements are generally low cost improvements and usually implemented within the existing right-of-way to increase efficiency or improve safety. Adding turn lanes or increasing traffic control at intersections or changing travel patterns are typical TSM actions. TDM measures, on the other hand, are directed at reducing the overall travel demand on the transportation infrastructure and may include bus, transit, rail, ride-sharing, park and ride, high occupancy vehicle lanes and work hour management alternatives. Frank noted that inventories of existing levels of bus, rail and park and ride services have been undertaken and current system improvement plans noted to assist in developing TDM-related improvement alternatives. For example, the consultant team is aware of the City of Dover's proposal for a new park and ride facility to be located in the Exit 9 area.

With respect to upgrading the corridor, alternatives to widen and rehabilitate the Little Bay Bridges, or to replace the Little Bay Bridges to provide 3 or 4 lanes in each direction would be considered. Alternatives to rehabilitate or replace the General Sullivan Bridge for local traffic, or for transit and HOV use only, or for pedestrians and bicyclists only, would be considered, as well as the alternative of removing the General Sullivan Bridge and providing a pedestrian/bicycle system connection as part of a Little Bay Bridges alternative. Bridge infrastructure alternatives

would be complemented by improvements to the mainline of the Turnpike and the interchanges. Frank concluded that he suspected a smart transportation solution would emerge that reflects a combination of TSM, TDM and Corridor Upgrade improvements, a solution that best balances meeting the purpose and need of the project with minimizing impacts on the environment and to property owners; a solution that is permissible, supported by the local communities and affordable.

Chris Waszczuk concluded the project team's presentation by identifying the five (5) phases of the project: (1) Scoping/Data Collection/Issue Identification; (2) Conceptual Alternative Development and Screening; (3) Preliminary Design and Impact Assessment of Alternatives that survive the Phase 2 screening/Draft EIS; (4) Public Hearing which presents and seeks approval for a Preferred Alternative; and (5) Final EIS which responds to comments. He noted that NHDOT and FHWA were currently reviewing the Phase 1 Draft Scoping Report, and that the Final Scoping Report would be posted on the project website once it was available for distribution.

Chris then reviewed the revised Project Schedule. He noted the effort to expedite the study in light of the priority and need for the project expressed by seacoast residents and local officials at past meetings and at the recent Governor's Advisory Council on Intermodal Transportation meeting held in Portsmouth on October 27<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the Public Hearing originally targeted for February 2006 had been moved up to target an October 2005 date. He also noted that the FHWA Record of Decision was now targeted for November 2006, which was a critical milestone and would allow funding for the final design and right-of-way acquisitions to commence. If funding is available, construction could begin as soon as 2008.

Chris also noted that the public participation process was open and inclusive. A project advisory task force (ATF) of 15 members has met and will continue to meet quarterly to discuss the project status and guide the project's development. The ATF is made up of representatives from the municipalities of Dover, Newington, Durham and Portsmouth, the Dover and Portsmouth Chambers of Commerce, the Strafford and Rockingham Planning Commissions, COAST, the environmental community, the NHDOT, and FHWA. The ATF meetings are open to the public. Public informational meetings will be held in each phase of the study and will include notification of the abutters within the project limits. Also, meetings with state and federal resource agencies are scheduled to continue on a regular basis. The project website hosts a wealth of information, and is updated periodically. All meeting notes, reports, plans, etc. will be posted on the website once available. Lastly, the public hearing, as previously mentioned, is targeted for October 2005. Chris finished his comments by reminding the attendees that they could contact Bill O'Donnell at FHWA or Bill Hauser and himself at NHDOT for further information or to offer further comment. He also requested that attendees remember to sign the attendance sheet before leaving.

### OPEN DISCUSSION

At approximately 8:10, Chris Waszczuk opened the meeting to public discussion.

A member of the public asked whether the Powerpoint information presented during the meeting would be available on the project website. Chris Waszczuk replied that the presentation would be posted.

Randy Caruthers of 312 Dover Point Road asked whether the Department had given any consideration to constructing a tunnel under the Little Bay, rather than expanding the bridges. Chris Waszczuk replied that the Department had not, to date, considered building a tunnel. Chris explained that the existing bridges represent a substantial infrastructure investment. If at all possible, the Department wants to preserve this investment by rehabilitating/reusing portions of

the existing bridges to keep project costs reasonable. Construction of a tunnel would be prohibitively expensive, and thus had not been considered.

Edward Hoginski, of Dover Point Road, asked whether the Department has identified which houses will be taken for the highway project. Chris replied that Department has not yet initiated a detailed study of design alternatives. While the 2000 Feasibility Study identified some conceptual design alternatives, it could not evaluate whether those designs were feasible from an engineering perspective. The Department and its consultants will begin a study of design alternatives this winter and spring.

Gordon Smith commented that he felt the option of a tunnel made sense. He asked whether the Department is planning to also consider a multi-level bridge such as those found in Boston. Chris Waszczuk thanked Mr. Smith for his comment and indicated that the Department would consider the feasibility of a multi-level bridge.

A resident of Spur Road commented that, in his opinion, the noise from the highway is a significant problem. He asked how the Department plans to maintain traffic over the bridge during construction. He also commented that proper enforcement of the traffic laws in the area would encourage people to drive more safely, resulting in fewer accidents and fewer delays. Chris Waszczuk replied that, as part of the Environmental Impact Statement, the Department would evaluate ways to mitigate the noise issue. During design of the project, the maintenance of traffic during construction will be a large consideration and may actually affect the selection of the preferred alternative. Chris also commented that better enforcement may indeed help, but the NH State Police have limited resources to patrol the highways.

Kevin Duffy, a resident of Homestead Lane, asked whether representatives of the local communities are on the Advisory Task Force. Chris Waszczuk replied that members from Dover and Newington, as well as Portsmouth and Durham, are on the ATF. Mr. Duffy asked how construction would be phased. Chris replied that it is too early to know how the project would be constructed in any detail. The phasing would occur in such a way as to minimize construction impacts with the bridge likely being addressed first. It is likely that the project would be built in several contracts over several years to minimize disruptions. Mr. Duffy then followed up by asking who "approves" the project. Chris explained that several resource agencies would need to issue permits. Moreover, the layout of the project must be reviewed and ultimately approved by a "Special Committee" made up of three Executive Councilors. This Committee will be responsible for overseeing the public hearing process.

Roger Rivers, of Spur Road, asked whether the Tolls would be moved or expanded. Chris Waszczuk explained that previous studies had shown that traffic north of the tollbooths would operate at acceptable levels in the future. Tolls are a statewide concern, and have a set of separate complicating issues. Currently, there are no plans to modify the tolls as part of this project. Mr. Rivers also commented that there are no facilities at the toll plaza rest stop adjacent to Spur Road. This causes a problem, and Mr. Rivers requested that the state install toilet facilities at the toll plaza rest stop.

Kevin Duffy asked if the traffic backups would simply move to the tollbooths after the bridges are reconstructed. Chris explained that this question would be studied in detail in the EIS traffic analysis.

Pam Long, Dover Point Road, suggested that the Department consider a raised highway to minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods and Hilton Park. Chris Waszczuk replied that every opportunity to minimize the project footprint would be considered. The cost of such measures would be a factor in determining whether they are eventually implemented.

Carole Stiles, Dover Point Road, asked how the Department decides when to take a property in full versus only taking a portion of the property. Chris explained that this decision depends on a number of factors including the value of the land, whether a building on the property would need to be demolished, and the proportion of the property subject to impacts. Efforts to minimize property impacts include retaining walls and steepened slopes. If the property still has a high degree of impact, then a full acquisition would be considered.

Alice Briggs of Dover Point commented that she travels the highway daily during the worst hours. In her opinion, a significant problem is related to the Nimble Hill Road weave and the number of trucks attempting to access the Sprague Energy facility. She noted that part of the Interim Safety Project scheduled for construction in 2005 includes closing the reverse direction Exit 4. She recommends that the Department close Exit 4 now, rather than wait. Chris explained that the Interim Safety Project has already completed its public review. Early closure of Exit 4, prior to the related improvements to River Road and Nimble Hill Road, was not discussed. A decision to close Exit 4 early would need to go through a public review, which would be unlikely to conclude earlier than the current 2005 schedule for the Interim Safety Project.

Carole Appel, Isaac Lucas Circle in Dover, commented that there are a number of properties currently for sale in the project study area. She asked whether the Department would buy these properties as they come up for sale, which would limit the need to condemn on properties later. Chris Waszczuk replied that the Department is not authorized to acquire property until the federal Record of Decision (the decision of the Federal Highway Administration and its cooperating agencies on the project) is issued. FHWA's decision is not anticipated until 2006 under the current schedule.

Edward Hoginski asked how the Department intends to maintain two lanes of travel in each direction during construction. Chris Waszczuk suggested that the project construction sequence would need to carefully consider constructibility issues and the need to minimize impacts to traffic. Obviously, transportation in the area would not operate without at least two lanes in each direction. One possibility would be to construct a new bridge, then divert traffic to that new structure while the existing bridges are reconstructed. New lanes, either temporary or permanent, could be constructed in the median or outside the existing travel lanes to accommodate traffic.

Representative Art Pelletier (Dover) asked whether any consideration would be given to limiting access points on the highway. Chris Waszczuk replied that consolidation of access points would be a major feature of the design. Chris briefly reviewed the operation of the gas station at Nimble Hill Road under the Interim Safety Project design. There are currently too many access points within the study area, and too many of these have substandard geometry.

Representative Peter Smith (Dover) expressed considerable concern with increasing the size of the highway, explaining the "if you build it, they will come." While Rep. Smith sees problems with the suggestion of a tunnel or double-decker bridge related to prohibitive costs, he encouraged the Department to think creatively in developing a solution. For example, incentives for carpooling should be created. The goal should be to decrease congestion, not increase the number of cars the highway can accommodate. Chris Waszczuk indicated that he agreed with the Representative's comments and that the analysis will fully examine not only infrastructure upgrades, but also all available means of reducing traffic such as TSM and TDM measures. However, Chris noted that studies have shown that it is very difficult to get a significant portion of the public to use mass transit. The Department will ultimately try to develop a multi-modal solution.

Barbara Ridolfi, a resident of Pine View Drive, expressed concern that the Department needs to add signs at the bridge area specifying that drivers are to remain in their lanes. Mrs. Ridolfi criticized the Department for not taking action on her request sooner. Mrs. Ridolfi acknowledged that the Department intends to post the Scoping Report on the internet. But, she noted that all citizens of Dover should be concerned with the project and suggested that the Scoping Report be published on the front page of Foster's Daily Democrat. She also complained that she had not received a single piece of mail on the project, even though she asked to be on the project mailing list. In response, Mr. Waszczuk noted that he would discuss Mrs. Ridolfi's sign suggestion with the Bureau of Traffic, who is responsible for such matters. However, he noted that this is the first time that he has heard the suggestion. He also noted that, in addition to the internet, the Department will publish the Scoping Report in hard copy and will make it available in a number of places such as area municipal buildings and libraries. Finally, Mr. Waszczuk stated that he would ensure Ms. Ridolfi is listed on the project's mailing list.

Sam Bittner commented that the noise is his most substantial concern. He asked whether the locations of noise barriers would be identified on concept plans once completed. Also, Mr. Bittner commented that there should be a public hearing after the Final Environmental Impact Statement is issued. Mr. Waszczuk confirmed that concept plans would show the location of noise barriers. He also explained the public process. A major public hearing involving the regulatory agencies as well as the Special Committee (made up of three Executive Councilors) will follow publication of the Draft EIS which will identify the preferred alternative. A formal public comment period will follow this hearing. After this, the Department and the FHWA will consider and respond to all public comments in writing and by preparing the final Environmental Impact Statement. A subsequent public hearing following the final EIS is not anticipated.

Senator Iris Estabrook noted that she was in attendance mainly to listen to the Department's presentation and to hear public concerns. However, she inquired whether the planned Park & Ride project at Exit 9 might be constructed prior to the rest of the project and whether funding would be available. Chris Waszczuk replied that Park & Ride facilities qualify for CMAQ (i.e., federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program, administered by NHDOT) funding, which is available at about \$6 million annually. A park and ride facility could be constructed at Exit 9 with these funds sooner than the rest of the project.

A member of the public asked whether the Department could create a carpool lane now, rather than wait for the larger project. Chris Waszczuk replied that the Department would need to determine whether such a carpool (HOV) lane would be appropriately utilized and what type of traffic implications would result. In the long term, an HOV lane may be feasible. However, it may not be realistic in the short term to create a dedicated lane in the face of the severe current congestion.

Cynthia Copeland, representing the Strafford Regional Planning Commission, commented that there is the need to look at the bigger picture, including how residents of the area live and commute. By changing these patterns, the demand on the highway might be alleviated. The study must focus on all possible TDM strategies. Chris responded that realistic expectations of all feasible TDM strategies would be considered.

Edward Hoginski asked whether the study would ultimately make a recommendation about the fate of the General Sullivan Bridge. Mr. Waszczuk replied that the study would address the issue of the bridge, which would include rehabilitation and re-use or removal of the bridge.

A resident, noting that she had participated in the stated preference survey, asked whether transit options would be one way to reduce congestion. She stated that park and ride facilities may help the situation. Steve Lawe replied that about 5% of the respondents indicated that they would be



willing to change to a mass transit option if conditions for its use were optimal. The woman stated that the growth at the Pease International Tradeport had contributed to the highway congestion and suggested that employees of the Tradeport might be willing to use mass transit. Steve Lawe indicated that all feasible options for providing mass transit would be analyzed during the study. However, he noted that past studies had found that it is very difficult to encourage a significant number of commuters to change to transit options due to inherent issues of convenience.

Bill O'Donnell noted that the EIS would make recommendations on the final disposition of the General Sullivan Bridge. He noted that the State Historic Preservation Office would like to see the Bridge preserved. However, the US Coast Guard had indicated that the bridge is an impediment to safe navigation and therefore has suggested that the bridge be eliminated.

A general discussion of the General Sullivan Bridge followed. Since the bridge is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, it can only be impacted if there is no other feasible alternative. The EIS will therefore study the costs and engineering issues associated with its reuse. The bridge is considered the second most historic bridge in NH. Sam Bittner noted that the bridge is a recreational resource. Some people use the bridge to walk or to fish. Mr. Bittner argued that the bridge should be preserved for these purposes, even if it cannot be used for transportation. Tom Keegan commented that a new bridge could be built that would accommodate pedestrian and recreational use.

Spencer Strubel, of Dover Point Road, stated that the Department should consider regional transportation patterns during the study. He stated that the Department should consider new highway/bridge connections in an entirely different alignment such as to the west to avoid impacting Dover Point. Chris Waszczuk noted that the Great Bay is too wide to span. Generally, new alignments on new locations do not minimize impacts. The focus of the study will be on the current corridor, which is a major north-south route.

Julie Porter asked about incident management. She asked whether it is possible to create an "early warning system" such that drivers in the region would be informed about accidents or congestion in an effort to redirect their route choice. Chris Waszczuk replied that such a program is currently near implementation. Variable message boards should be in place by the spring/summer of 2004. A discussion followed in which several residents encouraged the Department to expedite the creation of this system.

Bruce Woodruff, Dover City Planner, referring to an earlier statement by Steve Lawe, stated that 5% of 80,000 to 100,000 trips is indeed a large number. He stressed that transit options must be part of the solution. Such measures should include implementing an express bus service in the region, creation of exclusive HOV lanes, and creation of park and ride facilities.

Ilean Bittner spoke in favor of preserving the General Sullivan Bridge. She stated that many people, not just local residents, use the bridge for recreation. She has met people from Rochester, Portsmouth and Rye while walking the bridge.

Rep. Art Pelletier inquired about the aesthetics of future noise barriers. Chris Waszczuk stated that decisions on the type of noise barrier construction likely would not be decided until the final design stage following the EIS.

Chris Cross, Chair of the Advisory Task Force, stated that the project is the highest priority transportation project for the Seacoast Metropolitan Planning Organization. Accordingly, the Department has prioritized the project. Mr. Cross commended the Department for compiling the present background data, and thanked citizens in attendance for their good ideas. Mr. Cross

stated that he believes the process for studying the transportation issues is excellent, but requested that citizens be patient. While the study will ultimately lead to solutions for the short term, intermediate terms and long term, the process is designed to provide adequate assessment of a large number of issues.

At approximately 9:30 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Noted by: M. Dugas, C. Waszczuk

cc: J. Brillhart  
C. Waszczuk  
M. Dugas  
M. Laurin  
H. Goodwin (Bureau of Turnpikes)  
W. O'Donnell, FHWA  
Town of Newington Selectboard  
Paul Beecher, Dover City Manager  
Newington-Dover ATF

### MEETING SIGN-UP SHEET

**PROJECT** Newington - Dover: Spaulding Turnpike improvements - Public Informational Meeting

**LOCATION** Dover City Hall

**PROJECT NO.** NHS-027-1(37)  
Federal

11238  
State

Name	Agency or Address	Comments
ROGER R. RIVERS	193 Spur Rd Dover	I live next to toll
JESSE N. BOX	400 DOWER PT. Rd	
KATHLYN G. BOX	400 DOWER PT. RD	
Tom Fargo	SRPC	
TIM ROACHE	JR PC	
RICHARD PEASE	NHDES	
MARTIN PERENICK	416 DOWER PT. RD	
COMMUNICATIONS CLINIC	420 DOWER PT. RD	
Jan Perenick	416 Dover Point Road	
SKIP SILVER	17 Peckow Av	
Roy Tosselyo	Dover	
FRANK + MARGARET MALONE	321 DOWER PT. RD. - DOWER	
Ed + Priscilla Jaramela	16 Boston Har.	
CLIFF ABBOTT	NEWINGTON NH.	
Ed St. Pierre	22 Leighton Rd Dover	
ART Pelletier	NH HOUSE OF REP	
Larissa Mulhern	Seawast Newspapers	
THOMAS KEEGAN	19 BOSTON HARBOR RD.	
Sen. Iris Estabrook	Dist 21	
CHERYL MACKAY	343 DOWER PT. RD. DOWER	SOUND BARRIER AT THE BEGINNING OF PROJECT - NOT AT THE END - THE MONEY RUNS OUT!
Debbie Burd	343 Dower Pt Rd Dover	
Jan MacMillan	14 Boston Harbor Rd	Very noisy now & had land taken away in last bridge construction. Concern of losing house.
Gordon Smith	14 Boston Harbor Rd	
Edward Hoginski	230 DOWER PT RD	
John Inger	CEO Consulting Eng	
Dave White	City of Dover	Spencer built the better
James & Diana YEMPS	409 Dower Pt. Road	CONCERNS ABOUT EVER INCREASING NOISE
ROY BARDWELL	199 SPUR RD.	NOISE - CONGESTION - CONST. ASOP
RICHARD D ISOM	6 HILTON RD	NOISE BARRER.
JOANNE B ISOM	6 HILTON RD	
Robert & Alice Bizzozzi	10 Gate Dr	eliminate reverse direction ramps
Eudya & Allen Schirpzius	23 Harlan's Way - Dover	
CHRIS CROSS	Rockingham Planning Commission / Newington rep	
Jack Newick	Newick's Restaurant - Dover	

## MEETING SIGN-UP SHEET

**PROJECT** Newington - Dover: Spaulding Turnpike improvements - Public Informational Meeting

**LOCATION** Dover City Hall

**PROJECT NO.** NHS-027-1(37)

11238

Federal

State

Name	Agency or Address	Comments
Harold Carter	403 Dover Pt Rd Dover NH	
Elaine Melanson	413 Dover Pt Rd	I would like to see sound barriers
LINDA N. STRUBLE	3160 DOVER PT RD	
BARBARA	22 WESTWORTH TER	
Rogers	22 Westworth Ter	
Dave Duane	27 Westworth Ter	
GARY LIMPAY	197 SPUR RD.	SOUND BARRIERS ARE PROBABLY NEEDED
Normand Cote	241 Toland Rd. Dover.	
Peter Schmidt	P.O. Box 1468 Dover	State rep.; keep me better informed
Barbara Rudolf	5 Pineview Dr Dover	speed controlled - sound barrier
BERTRAND STOFEMANN	18 WELLINGTON AVE, DOVER	DOUBLE DECKER IS BEST IDEA.
JULIE PORTER	300 Toland Rd. Dover	
Caroline French	23 Boston Harbor	
Pam & Paul Long	418 Dover Pt Rd	
Carole Miller	23 Boston Harbor Pt. Dover	
Sam & Bonnie Batten	346 Dover Pt. Rd. Dover	Sound Barriers positively required!
Sharon Robinson	354 Dover Pt. Rd. Dover	
Carol Stiles	422 Dover Pt Rd	Either Sound Barriers or take my house
Ann Shine	419 Dover Pt Rd	Raised Highway - Double layer bridge
Kim Kelly	24 Beech Rd Dover	
George McConaughy	116 Middle St. Portsmouth	
Betty & Brian Greene	393 Dover Pt. Rd.	
M. Rist	23 Lake Drive Dover	
Terie Moralli	35 Middle Rd Ports	State Rep - Ports/News.
Bob & Pam MacKellar	334 Dover Pt. Road	
Rob Riccio	54 Sjurvik Rd Berwick, ME	
Steve Staunton	21 River Rd Newington	
Michael Sheffield	350 Dover Point Rd Dover	
KEVIN DUFFY	4 HOMESTEAD LANE, DOVER	
Cynthia Goodland	SRPC	
Carole A. Appel	116 Isaac Lane Wilton, Dover	
Robert M. Rowe	407 Dover Point Rd, Dover	
Nora Kelley	348 Dover Point Rd Dover	I would like to see WIDE publication of these meetings
Frank & Dorene Stern	67 Clearwater Dr, Dover	
PETER FORSYTHE	1223 Spaulding Trk Newington	
Cecile Poliquin	5 FORSYTHIA DR DOVER	
	6 HOMESTEAD LANE DOVER	