



**Meeting  
Notes**

Attendees: Chris Cross, ATF Chairman, RPC  
Marlon Frink, ATF Vice Chairman, Newington  
Dave Allen, Portsmouth  
Bruce Woodruff, Dover  
Jack Newick, Dover  
Rick Card, Dover Chamber of Commerce  
Maria Stowell, PDA  
Tom Fargo, SRPC  
Cynthia Copeland, SRPC  
Sandy Hislop, Newington  
Butch Wadleigh, FHWA  
Mel Jenkins, Lee  
Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT  
Mike Dugas, NHDOT  
Frank O'Callaghan, VHB  
Bruce Tasker, VHB  
Greg Bakos, VHB  
Members of the Public

Date/Time: March 31, 2004 / 6:30 PM

Project No.: 5142500

Place: Newington Town Hall

Re: ATF Meeting No. 5  
(Work Session)

Notes taken by: Frank O'Callaghan

---

Chris Cross, ATF Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM. He reviewed the agenda and reminded all present that this evening's meeting was a work session for the ATF and that public input is welcome. Following a project overview by Chris Waszczuk and Frank O'Callaghan, there would be a discussion of concepts developed to date, refinements to those concepts based on input received tonight, and a wrap-up.

Chris then asked if there were any comments on the draft minutes of the January 28, 2004 ATF meeting held at Dover City Hall. Chris Waszczuk noted under the list of attendees that Brian Mazerski represented the Coastal Program of the Office of State Planning, and that Peter Wellenberger represented the NH Department of Fish and Game. He also noted a typographical error on page 6; Frank O'Callaghan noted a similar typographical error on page 2. With these corrections noted, the meeting minutes were unanimously accepted by the ATF, with the abstention of Marlon Frink who was not in attendance at the January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Prior to initiating the presentation and discussion on conceptual alternatives, Chris Cross asked if there were any questions or comments from the ATF and public. Chris Waszczuk noted that e-mail

correspondence to both Jack Newick and Fred Pearson (ATF alternate) had been undeliverable. Jack noted that he will check out his computer and internet service and will follow-up with Chris Waszczuk. Tom Fargo stated that he would contact Fred Pearson and follow-up with him to resolve the problem. At Marlon's suggestion, Chris Waszczuk reminded those in attendance of the project's website, [www.newington-dover.com](http://www.newington-dover.com).

There being no further comments, Frank O'Callaghan initiated the presentation of conceptual alternatives by briefly reviewing the design constraints and requirements that form the context of the study area that extends from north of Exit 1 (Gosling Road) to a point just south of the Dover toll plaza. He noted environmental resources such as coastal and surface wetlands, floodplains, cultural resources, recreational resources such as Hilton Park, marine habitat and wildlife; he also identified issues such as navigational requirements, local connectivity, property impacts, noise, future land development, cost and affordability. These resources and issues frame the context within which conceptual improvement alternatives are being developed to address the safety and mobility needs of both motorized and non-motorized study area travelers. Frank also reviewed roadway design criteria such as design speed, lane and shoulder widths, grades and access control. He noted with respect to the Turnpike that 4 lanes in each direction would be required to serve future (2025) peak hour travel demands and provide a level-of-service 'D' vis-à-vis the quality of traffic flow and traffic operations. As a quality measure of traffic flow, levels-of-service range from 'A' at best to 'F' at worst, with LOS 'C' usually used for design purposes, and LOS 'D' usually deemed acceptable by federal and state agencies when providing for LOS 'C' would result in unacceptable environmental, community, or property impacts and/or would be too costly or unaffordable.

In light of the study area resources and design related issues and criteria, Chris Waszczuk mentioned that the goal of tonight's meeting was to discuss the various conceptual alternatives developed for the bridges and the Turnpike, and to eliminate some of the alternatives that are not practical in order to ultimately have a manageable number of alternatives to study and progress further. He then initiated a presentation on the bridge alternatives by first discussing the general characteristics, condition, issues and reuse alternatives associated with the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB). He noted the nine span steel truss nature of the bridge, its length, width, navigational span and vertical clearance, and the fact that the bridge, which was constructed in 1935, has been closed to vehicular traffic since 1984. Chris summarized a number of issues and constraints which affect the reuse potential of the bridge including: bridge geometry, structural capacity and poor physical condition, seismic considerations, historic value, navigation requirements and permitting, and the cost of rehabilitation/reuse alternatives, and long term maintenance cost. Chris noted that the bridge is the second highest rated historical bridge in the state, that the state's Architectural Historian spoke to the history and significance of the structure at the January 28, 2004 ATF meeting, and that SHPO is recommending *in-situ* preservation. He also noted that the USCG, as a matter of policy and as stipulated in the 1982 amended bridge permit for the Little Bay Bridges, requires structures no longer used for transportation purposes to be removed. Should a use for the General Sullivan Bridge be identified, the structure rehabilitated, and maintained in the future, the USCG would re-visit the permitting process for that structure.

Chris then summarized the GSB Reuse Alternatives and associated costs:

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| • Multi-Use Path   | \$19M |
| • Pedestrians, Bicyclists and Vehicles (6 ton limit)                 | \$20M |
| • Pedestrians, Bicyclists and Local Traffic (no weight restrictions) | \$22M |
| • Replacement Bridge (including removal costs)                       | \$36M |
| • Removal of General Sullivan Bridge                                 | \$ 5M |

(cost of replacing pedestrian/bicycle connection not included)

Tom Fargo asked if the replacement cost (\$36M) was reflective of a similar type bridge. Chris confirmed that it was. Bruce Woodruff commented that he had hoped to see an alternative for an exclusive bus way or transit use. He expressed concern that a General Sullivan Bridge proposal for local traffic use may result in local neighborhood opposition, whereas similar local objection may not occur with an exclusive bus way or transit use combined with a recreational use for the bridge. Chris responded that the cost of such an alternative would be akin to the local traffic reuse alternative and would cost approximately \$22M. Chris mentioned that the exclusive bus way/transit/recreational use alternative will be specifically noted in future presentations. Chris also mentioned that reuse alternatives would also require future maintenance costs – repainting and structural repairs every 25 years at a cost (2004 dollars) of \$4.3M; and deck replacement every 35 years at a cost (2004 dollars) of \$1.4M. Tom Fargo suggested that deck deterioration due to deicing and salt should decrease due to the non-motorized nature of the current use and possibly future use. Chris concurred that the affect of salt/de-icing on deterioration would be less, but deterioration would not be eliminated due to the marine environment.

Chris Waszczuk then summarized the characteristics of the existing Little Bay Bridges with respect to year of construction, length, width, navigation and vertical clearance, geometry and cross-section of several widening alternatives which provide – based on the future travel demand projections – 4 lanes of travel in each direction. In the comparison of alternatives – widening to the west, widening to the east, widening to both sides, and a new bridge with a multi-use path – Chris noted the following: all the cost estimates are based on similar length structures; widening to the west will reduce impacts to the bay and Hilton Park, but constructability issues due to the proximity of the General Sullivan Bridge (15'±) may increase costs slightly; widening to the east may require lengthening of the bridge to minimize impacts to the bay and Hilton Park which will add cost, yet be easier to construct; widening to both sides, while increasing the separation distance from the GSB (58'±) introduces some construction inefficiencies which will increase cost, create maintenance of traffic issues, and may still impact the bay and Hilton Park; a new bridge with a multi-use path would entail the removal of the GSB, construction of the new bridge off location while the existing bridges maintain traffic, and removal of the existing Little Bay Bridges following construction of the new bridge. He noted that the new bridge may need to be extended on the Newington approach to allow restoration of some coastal wetlands as suggested by the ACOE. Hilton Park would also be impacted by a new bridge off location.

With respect to rehabilitation and widening alternatives, Chris noted that there were two (2) levels of rehabilitation, and depending upon the potential to replace the existing superstructure with weathering steel (which would save on future maintenance costs), the cost of rehabilitation and widening could range from \$46M to \$50M.

Bruce Woodruff asked if the rehabilitation and widening cost estimates included seismic retrofitting and if the existing bridge profile would be held. Chris responded that the costs reflect seismic retrofitting, and that the existing profile would be maintained with any of the rehabilitation alternatives. Tom Card asked if the cost estimates were in 2004 dollars. Chris responded that they were 2004 dollars, and noted that there would be an approximate 12% additional cost -on if a multi-use path was incorporated into the design for the Little Bay Bridges.

Chris next described a double-decker concept that would place the northbound travel lanes above the southbound lanes in an attempt to minimize the footprint and subsequent impacts of the bridge and

roadway approaches to the bridge. Double-decking requires a new substructure, a 30-foot vertical separation between roadway surfaces on the bridge, extension of the elevated bridge approaches by approximately 900' in Newington and 1200' in Dover with approximately 650'( $\pm$ ) of retaining wall. The cost of double-decking is approximately \$75M, entails a number of constructability and maintenance of traffic issues (i.e. erecting girders and transverse members would not be permitted above traffic on the existing bridge) and may not ultimately reduce the potential impacts on the Dover side of the bridge.

Replacement bridge alternatives include conventional bridges – without a multi-use path – ranging in cost from \$55M (steel girder) to \$63M (segmental precast concrete box girder), and signature bridges which include a multi-use path. Chris displayed conceptual cross-section and elevation plans for both an open spandrel concrete arch bridge (\$87M) and a single cable-stayed bridge (\$90M). He noted that the 305 foot elevation above mean sea level at the top of the main pier would be an issue for the FAA vis-à-vis the aviation approach and clearance zone for the runway at the Pease Tradeport.

Chris then referred to a construction cost summary table for all of the combined General Sullivan and Little Bay Bridges alternatives. These combined alternatives were categorized into two (2) major groups: Little Bay Bridge alternatives with the GSB rehabilitated, and Little Bay Bridge (LBB) alternatives with the GSB removed. Assuming that the GSB is rehabilitated, the total estimated bridge costs – for both GSB rehabilitation (\$19M) and the rehabilitation or replacement of the LBB – ranged from \$65M to \$87M; assuming that the GSB is removed, the total estimated bridge costs – for GSB removal (\$5M) and the rehabilitation or replacement of the LBB and inclusion of a 16' multi-use path – ranged from \$57M to \$100M. Chris noted that the Department considers cost to be an important factor in light of the current financial environment, and at this time, desires the alternative that rehabilitates and widens the Little Bay Bridges, which includes a multi-use path and the removal of the General Sullivan Bridge, be included in the further study. This alternative will cost \$57M (excluding road construction) and is the lowest cost combined alternative. He stated that while this alternative reflects funding realities, he is seeking comments from the ATF and others. Bruce Woodruff asked if the \$100M cost of the cable-stayed bridge could be reduced by relative cost reduction on the roadway approaches. Chris responded that differences in roadway approach costs may or may not be affected by the bridge alternatives, and will be determined as the overall alternatives are further developed. However, the savings or additional cost, as the case may be, is not at this time considered to be significant, given the order-of-magnitude cost difference (\$57M - \$100M) in range of alternatives. Bruce continued that he believes that one needs to take into account other considerations, such as the future vision of the area, aesthetics, social impacts, and projected capacity needs, in addition to cost, in choosing a preferred alternative for the future. Chris responded that, vision aside, the \$57M alternative provides the same general level of safety and capacity improvement that \$100M bridge alternative provides. Jack Newick asked if the life span of the \$57M and \$100M alternatives was the same. Chris responded that they had similar life spans. Frank O'Callaghan suggested that perhaps comparing total costs of alternatives – bridge and roadway – would help in focusing the contrast or difference in scale of cost among some of the alternatives, and that roadway costs would be further refined following input from this evening's meeting. At this point, Chris identified three corrections to the summary cost table: the column heading "General Sullivan Removal/Cost" should read "Little Bay Bridge Removal Cost"; the Replacement – Steel Girder Cost for the Little Bay Bridge Cost (assuming General Sullivan Rehabilitation) should be \$55M (instead of \$46M), resulting in total cost of \$79M (instead of \$70M).

Tom Fargo stated he was having a difficult time visualizing/relating to level-of-service 'D' traffic operations and flow, and questioned the need for 4 lanes in each direction... Discussion ensued on density of traffic and traffic speed along similar urbanized freeway type facilities, such as I-95 and I-

93/Central Artery in Boston. Frank O'Callaghan will provide a visualization guide on level-of-service at the next ATF meeting. Tom also questioned how the reported \$30M cost estimate for dedicated federal funding for the project affected the bridge alternatives and cost estimates presented tonight. Chris responded that the \$30M estimate could provide a comparable "sister-like" structure to the existing Little Bay Bridges. The \$30M in dedicated funding would allow the bridge construction to possibly start earlier than the current funding programmed for the project (current draft 10-Year Plan shows construction funding beginning in 2010). The basic rehabilitation and widening alternative cost estimate of \$46M accounts for \$30M for a sister structure and an additional \$16M to rehabilitate, paint, and seismically retrofit the existing Little Bay Bridges.

Marlin Frink asked if construction of any of the alternatives would require shutting down or reducing traffic flows on the existing bridges. Chris responded that maintenance of traffic would be more difficult for some alternatives (i.e. rehabilitation/widening to both sides would necessitate further constriction of the existing narrow width of the Little Bay bridges during the rehabilitation), and that the double-decking alternative would be particularly problematic to maintain traffic on the bridges while erecting members overhead. A critical component for any of the bridge alternatives will be the need to maintain two lanes of traffic in each direction during construction. Traffic flow along the Turnpike would not be able to be shut down. Jack Newick observed that the \$57M alternative makes considerable sense. It has the same life span as other alternatives, widening to the west side seemed to present less impact on the bay and Hilton Park, traffic would be maintained during construction, and that one needs to consider the impact of inflation on the cost of alternatives, i.e., costs will only increase and that it may be imprudent to think that the \$100M alternative will not escalate over time. Bruce Woodruff noted that the rehabilitation/widening alternatives do not address the current profile of the bridges which limit drivers sight distance and design speed to 60 mph. Chris Waszczuk acknowledged the 60 mph design speed profile, but indicated that the area is posted for 50 mph and there were a number of other factors in addition to profile that affect driver safety on the bridges and bridge approaches including substandard shoulder widths, traffic movements (merging, weaving, entering and exiting, and changing lanes) and driver decision-making in proximity to the bridge approaches that are compounded by the spacing of interchanges, and the volume and speed of vehicles. The rehabilitation and widening alternatives, in conjunction with the roadway improvement alternatives, will improve all of these additional conditions within the context of a 60 mph design speed.

Chris Cross stated that the cost summary of bridge alternatives was useful in identifying the range of alternatives and costs which provide the same level of traffic capacity. Tom Fargo inquired as to the availability of technology to reduce the number of bridge piers and spans. Chris Waszczuk responded that any of the new bridge replacement alternatives including the cable-stayed and concrete arch alternatives could reduce the number of piers in the bay. With respect to the grade-separated, east-west connector in Dover, Tom suggested moving it as close to the water as possible by adding an additional span to the bridge. In this way, Hilton Park could be connected and the park area enhanced due to the opening and proximity to the water. While the waterfront location of the connector will add cost to the bridge alternative, the enhancement to the park is worth considering. Frank O'Callaghan indicated that relocating the east-west connector, as suggested, would be explored.

At this point in the meeting, Chris Waszczuk asked if the ATF would consider dropping one or more of the bridge alternatives. There was no consensus at this time to drop any alternative.

Frank O'Callaghan then described a number of Transportation System Management (TSM) alternatives to improve safety and traffic operations in the short term. These ideas had been briefly identified at the January 28, 2004, ATF meeting:

- Extending the NB Exit 6W deceleration lane to the US4 westbound loop ramp by approximately 400' to prevent PM peak hour exiting traffic from backing up into the NB through lane traffic. This modification can be implemented within the existing shoulder area without affecting the bridge abutment and will improve 2005 LOS from 'D' to 'C'.
- Merging the 2-lane SB on-ramp at Exit 6 to a single lane prior to the merge with the main line, coupled with carrying two through lanes on the Turnpike through the Exit 6 interchange to merge with the single SB on-ramp. Currently the two through lanes merge to a single lane. Frank discussed how current traffic volumes on the mainline (2,500, AM peak hour) warrant the two-lanes; and that the 1,500 vehicles entering on the SB on-ramp could be accommodated in a single lane, and that the single lane merge operation would be an improvement in comparison to existing conditions. He also pointed out that the proposed changes would make it safer and easier for drivers to be in the proper lanes (either outside or inside) when planning to exit at Nimble Hill Road (Exit 4) or Woodbury Avenue (Exit 3). Frank presented a micro-simulation of both the existing and proposed merge conditions. He also pointed out that, while improving the merge condition (2005 LOS 'D'), the TSM action would not eliminate the capacity condition on the Little Bay Bridges.
- Assuming implementation of the Newington Interim Safety Plan (2005 scheduled construction) which eliminates the SB to NB turnaround in the median, the existing SB deceleration lane to Woodbury Avenue could be extended by 600', improving 2005 LOS from 'E' to 'D'.
- Assuming implementation of the Newington Interim Safety Plan, development of a NB auxiliary lane between Exit 3 and Exit 4. Under this concept, the NB on-ramp from Woodbury Avenue would be carried with the two through lanes from Exit 2 to form three lanes, and carried northbound to Exit 4 (River Road) where the auxiliary lane would form a deceleration lane to Exit 4. The on-ramp from River Road would merge with the two through lanes prior to the bridge. Currently, the merge from Woodbury Avenue, coupled with the merge from the SB to NB median U-Turn on the high speed/inside through lane and the weaving of traffic from this median on-ramp to the River Road off-ramp, create congestion during the PM peak hour which causes NB traffic to queue back through the Exit 2 interchange area, and results in some Woodbury Avenue traffic diverting to Shattuck Way/River Road via Patterson Lane in an effort to bypass the queued Turnpike traffic and rejoin the Turnpike via the Exit 4 on-ramp. With the elimination of the merging traffic reversing direction and entering the NB traffic flow from the median, coupled with the elimination of a weaving maneuver, and the extension of the 3<sup>rd</sup> NB lane from Woodbury Avenue to River Road, the Woodbury Avenue merge of traffic and the exit of traffic at River Road will be significantly improved and delays on queuing of NB through traffic reduced. Frank presented a micro-simulation of traffic operations under both current and proposed conditions. He suggested that in conjunction with development of the auxiliary lane, the access from Woodbury Avenue to Shattuck Way/River Road via the River Road/Patterson Lane connection should be closed to prevent Turnpike traffic from spilling over to River Road only to rejoin the Turnpike at Exit 4. If Woodbury Avenue-to-Spaulling Turnpike traffic continues to divert to Shattuck Way/River Road, following implementation of the proposed TSM improvement, then ramp-metering via a new traffic signal operation at the River Road/Exit 4 on-ramp could be considered to meter on-ramp traffic and discourage non-industrial area generated traffic from diverting to River Road to access the Turnpike.

Frank mentioned that "Stay in Lane" signs on both NB and SB approaches to the bridge should also be maintained and possibly enhanced by the addition of flashing beacons to

reinforce drivers the safety importance of not abruptly changing lanes either on the bridge approaches or on the bridge. The feasibility of using rumble strips vis-à-vis lane lines on the bridge was raised as further reinforcement to stay in one's lane. Chris Waszczuk replied that rumble strips on the bridges were not feasible due to the existing thin pavement depth and would not be considered by the Department.

Frank also stated that ideas suggested by others to close or restrict NB access to the Turnpike at Exit 2, 3, and 4 during the PM peak hour, and to reroute that traffic via Woodbury Avenue and Gosling Road would be problematic and impractical; however, these ideas underscored the level and urgency of the congestion problem, and stimulated the thinking behind the recommended TSM actions in Newington.

Tom Fargo and Jack Newick reminded Frank and the ATF of the need to improve NB signage at Exit 6 to better inform drivers of the 6E and 6W ramps; some drivers wishing to go west on US 4 or connect to Boston Harbor Road and Dover Point Road mistakenly take the first exit ramp (6E) and then reverse direction in proximity to the ramp terminal area on Dover Point Road. The NB signage approaching Exit 6 will be reviewed.

Following discussion of the proposed TSM actions, the ATF unanimously endorsed the implementation of the TSM measures.

Frank then presented a number of long term improvement concepts in both Dover and Newington. In Dover, common to the three alternatives was implementing two-way traffic flow on the Exit 6 overpass and constructing a new NB on-ramp to the Turnpike. Frank compared Alternative 2 with Alternative 1, and noted that Alternative 2 eliminated the double loop ramp operation (NB to WB traffic) by substituting a traffic signal/diamond interchange operation; Alternative 2 had a smaller footprint resulting in less property impacts than Alternative 1; Alternative 2 provided a grade separated connection between east and west side of Hilton Park; traffic signal operations would operate at LOS 'C' or better in the design year (2025); and Alternative 2 (\$23M) would cost approximately \$2M less than Alternative 1 (\$25M). Alternative 2 seemed to address Dover's main concerns, that being the minimizing of property impacts and the maximizing of east-west connectivity. Frank also presented a third concept (Alternative 3), which is similar to Alternative 2, except that it provides a grade separated local connector between Spur Road and Boston Harbor Road; it eliminates the traffic signal at Spur Road/US 4/Boston Harbor Road, restricting all turns to right in/right out; allows free flow of US 4 traffic SB onto the Turnpike in a single lane; and costs approximately \$25M. Discussion ensued about the benefits of removing local traffic from the interchange operation, and assuring that all local traffic connections were accounted for. Frank assured Tom Fargo that there was adequate storage for NB exiting ramp traffic given the volume of traffic and traffic signal operation, and Jack Newick raised the need for adequate signage given the changes in local traffic circulation. Following this discussion, the ATF unanimously agreed that Alternative 3 was appealing and more desirable for Exit 6. It was agreed that Alternative 3 should be refined further to minimize impacts to wetlands, and progressed in the EIS. Also, some sentiment existed to evaluate a possible roundabout at Dover Point Road in order to eliminate the eastern most signal and limit impacts further north on Dover Point Road.

Frank next presented three alternatives in Newington. Alternative 6 maintains interchanges at Exit 4 and Exit 3; provides access to the Tradeport; relocates the Pease Railroad spur right-of-way south to run parallel to Patterson Lane; discontinues Exit 2 due to its proximity to the new Exit 3 off and on ramp; provides satisfactory traffic operations; provides a convenient at-grade cross-over location for

incident management; and costs approximately \$27M. In comparison to Alternative 7 (single point diamond interchange), Alternative 6 has less visual impact, less property impact/smaller footprints and is less costly (approximately \$14M).

Alternative 7 is a single point diamond interchange that combines interchanges at Exit 3 and Exit 4. Similar to Alternative 6, Alternative 7 provides a connection to the Tradeport; discontinues access to the Turnpike from Exit 2 and relocates the Pease spur railroad right-of-way south to run parallel to Patterson Lane. In addition, Alternative 7 provides improved access to Newington's industrial area. The interchange has greater property impacts than Alternative 6, and also presents a significant visual impact due to the nature of the intersection design and the extent of necessary retaining walls. The cost of Alternative 7 is approximately \$41M or \$14M more than Alternative 6. From a traffic operations perspective, the 2-lane NB on-ramp merge with the mainline may be problematic given the proximity of the bridge and the need to merge the 2-lane on-ramp with three through lanes and then drop a lane prior to the bridge.

Frank next presented Alternative 9, which consolidates both Exit 4 and Exit 3 in the vicinity of Woodbury Avenue. Alternative 9 provides access to the Tradeport, improves access to the industrial area, provides local access to Nimble Hill Road and potential access to future development at the old drive-in site; and discourages the SB free flow access to Woodbury Avenue. Alternative 9 would cost approximately \$26M, would not relocate the railroad right-of-way, and would have less visual impact than Alternative 7. Traffic operations would be satisfactory.

Discussion ensued in a comparative manner on all three alternatives. There was consensus by the ATF to drop Alternative 7 from further consideration due to the visual/barrier impact, relative cost and traffic operational concerns. There was also consensus to fashion a melding of Alternative 6 and Alternative 9 into another Alternative. Tom Fargo raised the issue of access to future development land (e.g. the drive-in site) which was evident under Alternative 9 and would require access from the PDA connector roadway (and right-of-way) under Alternative 6. The layout of the SB loop ramp to Woodbury Avenue under Alternative 6 would affect access to the City of Portsmouth's water tank, and as such, would need to be revised. With respect to Alternative 6, Sandy Hislop noted the lack of an industrial area connection perpetuates the presence of truck traffic and noise into Nimble Hill Road and Newington's residential area. While acceptable to the Town of Newington as a temporary condition under the Interim Safety Improvement Plan, the Town of Newington will not support the industrial connection between River Road and Nimble Hill Road as a permanent solution. Marlin Frink and Chris Cross concurred. Tom Fargo suggested investigating the possibility of relocating the industrial access connector, depicted in Alternative 9, south to either the Exit 2 or the Woodbury Avenue interchange area. This would allow lowering the profile of the Turnpike, as in Alternative 6, but would also provide an industrial connection to Shattuck Way. VHB will investigate/refine Alternative 6 and Alternative 9 based on the feedback from the ATF.

Following discussion on the long term conceptual improvement alternatives, Cynthia Copeland asked if signage on I-95, NB could be reviewed by the NHDOT with the intent of directing drivers destined for Concord to use NH101 to I-93 versus utilizing the Turnpike and US 4. The signage will be reviewed. Cynthia also wanted clarification that under the rehabilitation/widening bridge alternatives, the current profile of the Little Bay Bridges remains. Chris Waszczuk confirmed that she was correct – the existing bridge profile would be maintained under the bridge rehabilitation/widening alternatives.

The next meeting of the ATF is scheduled for April 28, 2004 in Newington, and a follow-up ATF meeting was scheduled for June 23, 2004 in Dover.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM.