



**Meeting
Notes**

Attendees: Chris Cross, ATF Chairman, RPC
Bruce Woodruff, Dover
Sandy Hislop, Newington
Maria Stowell, PDA
Tim Roache, SRPC
Steve Wells, COAST
Peter Wellenberger, NHF&GD
Bill O'Donnell, FHWA
Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT
Jack Newick, Dover
John Burke, Portsmouth
Mike Dugas, NHDOT
Marc Laurin, NHDOT
Gary Kassoff, USCG
Jim Garvin, SHPO
Cynthia Copeland, SRPC
Frank O'Callaghan, VHB
Members of the Public

Date/Time: April 28, 2004

Project No.: 51425

Place: Newington Town Hall

Re: Newington-Dover 11238
ATF Meeting No. 6

Notes taken by: Frank O'Callaghan

Chris Cross, ATF Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:40 PM and welcomed all attendees. He explained that the purpose of the Advisory Task Force (ATF) and ATF meetings was to facilitate input from respective ATF constituencies to the project team, and to disseminate information from the project team back to their constituencies. He noted that the study to develop long term improvements to the Spaulding Turnpike was approximately one year old, and that Phase 1, an inventory of existing study area transportation and environmental conditions, was complete and summarized in a Scoping Report. He suggested that, aside from offering input at the ATF meeting, the public was encouraged to contact their respective community groups and to bring ideas or issues of concern to any member of the ATF.

Chris Cross then explained the meeting protocol – following presentation of information, ATF members will be asked for comment or questions, followed by questions and comments from the public. At his request, the ATF members introduced themselves. Following the introductions, the draft meeting minutes of the March 31, 2004 ATF meeting were reviewed. Chris Waszczuk noted two (2) typographical corrections; the draft meeting minutes were then approved, as amended.

Chris noted that Gary Kasso from the USCG was in attendance and would speak to navigation and bridge permitting issues. Chris stated that Chris Waszczuk and Frank O'Callaghan would discuss bridge and roadway alternatives, respectively. He thanked the public for coming out to the meeting, encouraged them to stay with the project, and emphasized that their input was needed. Chris reviewed the project schedule, noting that construction could begin in 2008 or sooner pending the availability of funding.

Chris Waszczuk then reviewed the meeting's agenda and noted that he hoped that the ATF, following the presentation on bridge and roadway alternatives, could narrow the range of reasonable infrastructure alternatives to carry forward in the study for detailed evaluation. He then introduced Gary Kasso, Bridge Program Coordinator, for the USCG. Gary noted that the USCG is responsible for permitting the bridges and is a cooperating agency with the FHWA and others in the study of bridge improvements. He reviewed the permitting history of the bridges noting that the original 1930's permit was first modified in 1964 when the first Little Bay Bridge was constructed. The permit modifications incorporated in 1982 when the second barrel of the Little Bay Bridges was constructed, should have required the removal of the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) since its transportation use had been terminated. The fact that the GSB had not been removed was a violation of federal law. Gary stated that the USCG has a responsibility to ensure that adequate vertical clearance under both the GSB and Little Bay Bridges (LBB) is maintained for navigational purposes. As the project advances, the USCG concerns will focus on addressing navigational needs, and the disposition of the GSB. If the GSB is not reused, the USCG will advocate for its removal due to its potential hazard to navigation. Gary noted that the LBB permit was last amended in 1982.

Peter Wellenberger asked if bicycle use is a viable reuse of the GSB from the USCG perspective. Gary replied that bicycle use is a viable transportation use of the GSB. Tim Roache, SRPC, and Peggy Lamson, Newington Selectwoman, noted that the GSB is designated as part of the state's bicycle route system; Gary stressed that the current permit for the General Sullivan bridge does not sanction its present use as solely a pedestrian and bicycle facility. With regard to navigational needs in the area, Sandy Hislop noted that some boaters from the Great Bay Marina have voiced concern about lowering the existing vertical clearance (VC). Gary responded that the USCG would not allow the existing VC to be reduced unless strong sentiment from the navigational community existed. He also stated that he/the USCG is looking for input on navigational needs, and that he will be reaching out to Sandy and others for their input. Chris Cross asked if the public had any concerns about navigation. There were none.

Chris Cross introduced Jim Garvin from the NH Division of Historical Resources who gave a brief history of the GSB. Jim noted that the GSB is the second highest ranked historic bridge in the state; its unique design is a testament to state-of-the-art design and construction in 1935, and construction of the bridge had a major impact on commerce and use of the Turnpike system. He stated that SHPO would advocate strongly for its preservation. Chris Cross noted that the significance of historic preservation would be taken into consideration with other issues, and suggested that if the bridge cannot be preserved in its current location, perhaps part of the structure could be preserved and relocated as a historic monument. Kate Mallon, a Portsmouth resident, expressed hope that the GSB could be preserved in its current location, noting her emotional attachment to the bridge. A Dover resident noted NHF&GD's proposal to reconstruct a boat ramp (in Hilton Park) in proximity to the GSB, and that the boat ramp project had been suspended pending the recommendations from the Newington-Dover Turnpike Improvement Study. He suggested that perhaps the NHF&GD project could be appended to the bridge project. Chris Waszczuk responded that NHDOT was aware of the boat ramp project and would coordinate with NHF&GD. Project mitigation may include constructing improvements to the boat ramp project. Discussion of the boat ramp project concluded with public comments identifying the need to improve boat launching capabilities, the need for

increased parking, the need for increasing the allowed boat speed in the channel due to the strength of the currents, and the idea of using boat registration fees to fund such projects.

Chris Waszczuk then prefaced his discussion of bridge alternatives by stating his hope that the ATF would be able to narrow the number of alternatives to carry forward for further evaluation based on the preliminary assessment of the conceptual alternatives to date. He reviewed the five (5) phases of the study process: phase 1 – scoping; phase 2 – development and screening of conceptual alternatives, and identification of a reasonable range of alternatives to carry forward for further evaluation; phase 3 – detailed evaluation of alternatives and recommendation of a preferred alternative and mitigation program; phase 4 – a public hearing to discuss the preferred alternative and mitigation program; and phase 5 – responding to comments on the evaluation of alternatives, the preferred alternative and the proposed mitigation program. He noted that the public hearing is tentatively scheduled for October 2005; he also mentioned that there was a project website, www.newington-dover.com, that hosts a wealth of project related information.

Chris then recalled that the ATF provided valuable feedback on the preliminary bridge alternatives at the March 31, 2004 ATF workshop which would be helpful in narrowing down the number of alternatives to carry forward. With respect to the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB), he reviewed general data – such as type of structure (steel truss), length (1,528'), width (24' curb-to-curb), width (275') of main navigation span, vertical clearance (48'-9", within center 100') – and the fact that the bridge was closed to vehicular traffic in 1984. He noted that the bridge is currently used by pedestrians and bicyclists. Chris then reviewed a number of factors which would affect rehabilitating the bridge such as bridge geometry and profile that limited driver sight distance to 45 mph; narrow cross-section; structural deterioration of deck, girders, truss members and joints; substructure deterioration below the water line; lead paint removal, and seismic vulnerability. He noted that the GSB could not be used as part of the traffic management plan for when the Little Bay Bridges are rehabilitated or replaced. Chris summarized the potential reuse and rehabilitation alternatives and associated costs, which ranged from a multi-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists (\$19 M) to a pedestrian, bicyclist and transit vehicle only alternative (\$22 M). A replacement bridge alternative (including the cost to remove the existing bridge) would cost approximately \$36 M. Chris noted that removing the GSB under any alternative would cost approximately \$5 M, and would not include the cost of replacing the pedestrian/bicycle connection. He also stated that future maintenance costs would approximate \$4.3 M (2004 dollars) every 25 years to repaint and repair the structure, and \$1.4 M (2004 dollars) every 35 years for deck replacement.

Chris followed his discussion of the GSB alternatives with a presentation on the Little Bay Bridge alternatives. He reviewed general data, such as length (1,589'), width (28' curb-to-curb, SB and 28'-6" curb-to-curb, NB), width (275') of main navigation span, and vertical clearance (46'-8", within center 100'). He then reviewed the existing bridge cross-section of two 12' lanes in each direction with two 2½' shoulders, and noted that future 2025 travel demand projections require four travel lanes in each direction. Rehabilitation and widening on the west side presents some construction challenges given the proximity of the GSB (approximately 15' between the GSB and widened LBB), but would minimize potential impacts on Hilton Park and the Bay (vicinity of Bloody Point) in comparison to the other alternatives. Widening on the east side would maintain the current distance between bridges, but would have a greater impact to the bay (vicinity of Bloody Point) and Hilton Park. Widening to both sides of the bridge would provide approximately 58' of separation between bridges, would still impact Hilton Park and the Bay shoreline area near Bloody Point, and would result in an inefficient construction method, working in the channel on both sides of the bridge. Traffic management during construction would also be more difficult.

Chris noted that constructing a new bridge, to replace both the LBB and GSB, would permit the current bridge profile to be improved. The existing profile provides a 60 mph design speed, while the posted speed on the bridge is 50 mph. Some have commented that the bridge profile contributes to the occurrence of accidents on the bridge. While the profile may be a contributing factor to accident potential, Chris noted other factors such as narrow/substandard shoulders, the many decision-points and traffic maneuvers on the bridge approaches and traffic congestion due to capacity constraints are prominent in the high accident potential in the area.

New bridge alternatives include double-decking and signature structures, in addition to steel girder and segmental concrete construction. The intent of double-decking was to reduce the footprint of the structure and thus reduce the impacts, particularly to Hilton Park. Chris noted the massive substructure required, the 30' in elevation between lower and upper decks, the necessity to close the lower level to traffic when constructing overhead, the elevated approaches to the bridge and the fact that impacts were similar to other less expensive bridge alternatives. With respect to the signature structures, he stated that both cable stayed and concrete arch bridges could reduce the number of piers in the channel, but both are costly. There is also a potential issue with the elevation of the main tower of the cable-stayed alternative extending into the controlled airspace of the Pease Tradeport.

Chris then reviewed the cost summary matrix of General Sullivan Bridge and Little Bay Bridges Combined Alternatives. The LBB alternatives, which included rehabilitation of the GSB ranged in cost from \$68 M to \$90 M. The LBB alternatives, which entailed removal of the GSB ranged in cost from \$57 M to \$100 M. Chris stated that he was hoping that the ATF could narrow down the number of alternatives to possibly three.

Chris Waszczuk then asked the ATF members if they had any questions. Hearing none, Chris Cross opened the questions to the public. A Newington resident asked if the \$22 M cost of GSB rehabilitation included total loading for all vehicles. Chris Waszczuk responded that it did, and that reuse of the GSB to bicycles and pedestrians only would cost approximately \$19 M.

There being no further questions on the bridge alternatives, Chris Waszczuk turned to Frank O'Callaghan to review the roadway alternatives. Frank began by describing the concept of level of service, noting the qualitative nature of the index of traffic operating conditions as measured by speed, delay and driver freedom to maneuver, comfort and convenience. Levels-of-service (LOS) range from "A" at best to "F" at worst, with LOS "B", "C", "D", and "E" representing the spectrum of conditions between "A" and "F". He noted that LOS "C" is usually used for design purposes, but that federal and state agencies generally accept LOS "D" for design when providing for LOS "C" would result in unacceptable impacts and/or costs. Frank stated the LOS "D" was the design criteria for the Newington-Dover improvement project, and that VHB had prepared a video and simulation of the varying levels-of-service along the Spaulding Turnpike to help ATF members and the public visualize the differences between levels-of-service.

Frank then played a video of traffic flow along the Turnpike at the Exit 6 interchange and the Newington approach to the bridge that depicted the increasing density of NB traffic flow as one progresses from LOS "A" to "E". He noted how traffic flow simulations can be calibrated based on actual traffic volume counts and observations, and then displayed a comparative simulation of traffic flows under LOS "C", "D", and "E" conditions for the Turnpike.

Following the level-of-service presentation, Frank reviewed the three (3) Dover roadway alternatives noting that two-way flow on the Turnpike overpass and the provision of a new NB on-ramp were common to all alternatives. He noted that Alternative 1 provided a two-lane loop ramp for the NB

Turnpike connection to WB US4, and that the at-grade circuitous E-W connection of Hilton Park via Boston Harbor Road, the overpass, and a new roadway on the east side of the Turnpike resulted in a relatively high number of property impacts in comparison to the other alternatives. Frank stated that the E-W connection of Hilton Park for local motorized and non-motorized traffic is important to the City of Dover, and that the City is willing to accept less efficient traffic operation at Exit 6 if property impacts can be reduced. Frank then described Alternative 2, which provides a grade-separated E-W connection of Hilton Park, and provides the NB Turnpike connection to WB US4 via a diamond-type signal controlled intersection – as opposed to the double loop ramp. In comparison to Alternative 1, property impacts are substantially reduced and traffic operation at the four (4) signalized intersections are satisfactory – LOS “C” or better. Alternative 3 modifies Alternative 2 by providing a grade separated connection between Spur Road and Boston Harbor Road. This connection – under the overpass and the SB on-ramp – enables local traffic to connect with Boston Harbor Road and Hilton Park without traversing the interchange area, and allows elimination of the Spur Road traffic signal by restricting turning movements to right-turns only. Previous ATF comments have favored Alternative 3, and suggested moving the Hilton Park grade-separated connection further south, as close to the channel as possible. Frank stated that the preliminary engineering study indicates the feasibility of relocating the connection closer to the channel as suggested, and presented a conceptual plan that modified Alternative 3 to that effect. In this way, an additional span could be added to the bridge – at additional cost – which would provide an opportunity to open the area under the span as additional park area.

Frank then reviewed the Newington roadway alternatives reminding all that Newington representatives had initially indicated community support for Alternatives 6 and 7 of the 2000 Spaulding Turnpike Feasibility Study. Alternative 6 maintains interchanges at both Exits 3 and 4, provides a roadway connector and a right-of-way for a future railroad connection (paralleling Patterson Lane) to the Tradeport at Exit 3, and would provide an ideal at-grade location for a crossover between the NB and SB barrels of the Turnpike for incident management. He noted that Alternative 6 lacked a connection between the Turnpike and the industrial area located between Shattuck Way and the riverfront, and that local traffic from Nimble Hill Road to Woodbury Avenue is required to use the Turnpike (assuming that drivers decline to use the circuitous back route of River Road and Shattuck Way). Frank also noted that the SB off-ramp to Woodbury Avenue at Exit 3 could be relocated slightly to the north (Alternative 6 Revised) to avoid impacting access to the City of Portsmouth’s water tower. Alternative 7 combines Exits 3 and 4 at a new single point diamond interchange. This alternative provides roadway connectors to both the Tradeport and the River Road-Shattuck Way industrial area, free-flow connections between the Turnpike and Woodbury Avenue, right-of-way for a future rail connection to the Tradeport that parallels Patterson Lane, and a local connector between Nimble Hill Road and Woodbury Avenue. Local access to future development at the former drive-in site could also be provided. Projected traffic volumes require a double NB on-ramp, which is problematic given the limited distance to merge prior to the bridge. The elevated structure of the Turnpike will present a major visual impact, and the cost of the interchange (based on the 2000 Feasibility Study) will be approximately 50 percent higher than Alternative 6.

Alternative 9 combines Exits 3 and 4 at Exit 3 via a SB two lane loop off ramp and a NB diamond type interchange. The local roadway connection to the Tradeport and the River Road – Shattuck Way industrial area is provided adjacent to the existing railroad right-of-way, which is preserved for a future connection to the Tradeport. A local roadway connects Nimble Hill Road to Exit 3 and Woodbury Avenue. The distance between the two-lane NB on-ramp at Exit 3 and the Little Bay Bridges is adequate for traffic merging prior to the bridge. Access to the former drive-in site could be provided from the local connector. Frank noted that the ATF reviewed Alternatives 6, 7, and 9 at the March 31 workshop meeting, and advised VHB to drop Alternative 7, and to focus on combining the

best elements of Alternatives 6 and 9 into a new concept. To that end, he then described Alternatives 10 and 11.

Alternative 10 is similar to Alternative 9 in that it combines Exits 3 and 4 at Exit 3 for SB traffic, and maintains the local roadway connection to the Tradeport and the River Road – Shattuck Way industrial area adjacent to the existing railroad right-of-way, which is preserved for a future connection to the Tradeport. The local roadway connection from Nimble Hill Road to Exit 3 and Woodbury Avenue is also maintained. However, the SB off-ramp at Exit 3 has been converted from a loop ramp – under Alternative 9, to a diamond configuration, and Alternative 10 also provides NB off- and on-ramps at Exit 4 (River Road). Alternative 11 is similar to Alternative 10, with the exception that the local connector to the industrial area and the preservation of a future rail right-of-way connection to the Tradeport have been relocated south to the Exit 3 interchange/Patterson Lane area. This results in a tri-level interchange area with the rail corridor and industrial access road running under Woodbury Avenue and the Turnpike, and the Woodbury Avenue extension traversing above the Turnpike to intersect the new connecting roadway to Nimble Hill Road.

Following Frank's presentation, discussion ensued. Tim Roache asked if there was adequate NB traffic weaving distance between the Exit 3 on-ramp and the Exit 4 off-ramp under Alternatives 10 and 11. Frank stated that there was sufficient weaving distance of approximately 2,000'. A Homestead Lane resident in Dover, referred to Dover Alternatives 2 and 3 and asked if the traffic signal operations at the Dover Point Road intersection located to the east of the NB off-ramp would result in queuing of WB vehicles and blockage of the Homestead Lane intersection. Frank responded that delays to WB vehicles would be minimal due to the low volume of Dover Point Road traffic entering the traffic stream. As such, potential blockage of Homestead Lane by WB queuing of vehicles is unlikely. A Newington resident asked if the SB to NB median turnaround between Exits 4 and 3 would be eliminated. Yes – as part of the Interim Safety Improvements, scheduled for 2005 construction. A Dover resident raised concern over noise attributed to proximity to the Dover toll plaza. Chris Waszczuk responded that noise mitigation is part of the study and, based on design criteria, monitoring of existing conditions and modeling of future conditions, mitigation may be appropriate. As concept alternatives are developed, mitigation plans will be refined, as required. Another resident stated that existing noise laws, *vis-à-vis* motorcycles and trucks, need to be enforced.

Chris Cross reminded the ATF and public that the Dover toll facility was not part of the study and there is no plan to relocate the toll facility. Comments or questions regarding tolls in general or the Dover toll plaza in particular should be addressed to one's state representatives in Concord. A resident expressed frustration with the lack of enforcement to reduce SB speeding and traffic weaving during the AM peak period; Chris Waszczuk responded that public safety and incident management is a priority for NHDOT, and that NHDOT has conveyed such information to local and state public safety officials. He noted, however, that public safety officials have limited resources, and that the Newington-Dover study area is very compact and creates challenging conditions for traffic enforcement. Kate Mallon, Portsmouth resident, inquired as to the difference between solid double white versus solid double yellow pavement markings. Chris responded that both solid, double lines (either yellow or white) have the same meaning – do not cross. Solid double yellow markings are used between opposing traffic flows; solid double white markings are used between same directional traffic flows. He noted that pavement markings and signage on the Little Bay Bridges and approaches have been improved and conform to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. A resident inquired as to the potential noise and air quality issues if the profile of the Turnpike is raised. Chris responded that potential air quality and noise related impacts of alternatives that included raising the profile of the Turnpike would be assessed as part of the study.

Discussion ensued on bridge alternatives. A resident asked, assuming the rehabilitation of the GSB, any thought of utilizing the GSB and Boston Harbor Road for through traffic emanating from US4? Chris Waszczuk responded that the limited width of the GSB, and the need to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists, would likely prohibit through traffic use. Frank O'Callaghan added it was preferable to separate local traffic from through traffic and avoid the impact of through traffic on the residents of Boston Harbor Road and Dover Point Road. A resident then questioned the expenditure of \$22 M for rehabilitation of GSB assuming limited reuse of the bridge. Bruce Woodruff responded that a potential transit reuse would be compatible with pedestrians and bicyclists, and might justify the \$22 M rehabilitation cost. Kate Mallon expressed a desire to save the GSB, and suggested incident management as a potential reuse. Cynthia Copeland asked Steve Well's opinion *vis-à-vis* transit use of the GSB if there was an incident on the LBB. Steve responded that COAST would normally use the Turnpike. Bruce Woodruff added that his proposal for transit use is for the future, not as incident management for current conditions. A resident followed up asking if the GSB could be reused as part of a short term traffic solution. Chris Waszczuk responded that the GSB would not be suitable for such use or for traffic control during reconstruction of the LBB primarily due to its narrowness and profile. Chris Cross confirmed that the narrowness of the GSB is problematic for two-way traffic. Related to the Dover side of the channel, a resident asked if the proposed grade separated E-W connection running under the Turnpike connecting Hilton Park would have adequate vertical clearance and turning radii for trucks, noting that large trucks are sometimes used to transport boats to and from the boat ramp. Frank responded in the affirmative.

At this point, Chris Waszczuk noted that the project was approximately at the mid-point of Phase 2 of the study, and that he would propose that the ATF consider the following range of reasonable infrastructure alternatives to carry forward:

- Rehabilitation and widening of Little Bay Bridges with the General Sullivan Bridge rehabilitated.
- Rehabilitation and widening of the Little Bay Bridges with the General Sullivan Bridge removed.
- Replacement of the Little Bay Bridges with the General Sullivan Bridge removed.

With respect to these three (3) bridge alternatives, Chris proposed that the rehabilitation/widening or bridge replacement should occur on the west side of the existing LBB to minimize impacts on the bay/shoreline and on Hilton Park. As a side note, Chris stated that TDM alternatives were also being developed and would be discussed at the next ATF meeting. He further noted that despite the most optimistic projection of TDM impacts, 4-lanes of travel would likely be required per peak direction of flow on a daily basis, i.e. four lanes SB in the morning peak hour, and four lanes NB in the evening peak hour. With respect to roadway alternatives, Chris proposed carrying forward Alternatives 2 and 3 in Dover and Alternatives 10 and 11 in Newington. A resident asked if Alternatives 2 and 3 would require a new bridge over the Turnpike at Exit 6. Chris responded in the affirmative.

Chris Cross suggested that the ATF first discuss the bridge alternatives. With respect to the bridge replacement alternative, style of new bridge is still an open question. Chris Waszczuk noted that a new bridge would afford the opportunity to improve the roadway profile. He reminded all that the existing profile – which would be maintained under the rehabilitation/widening alternatives – meets 60 mph design speed criteria and that the bridge is posted for 50 mph speed limit. The NHDOT is satisfied that the current profile is acceptable, and that other roadway features – such as narrow shoulders and proximity of traffic maneuvers (e.g. traffic weaving and merging) on the bridge approaches will be improved under all alternatives. Chris also noted that the relatively high cost of some of the alternatives could delay construction as adequate funding is procured. Bruce Woodruff observed that a new bridge would convey a more open feeling towards Hilton Park. Chris Waszczuk

concluded, but noted the greater cost. Chris Cross asked if a new bridge would meet current seismic standards. Chris Waszczuk responded in the affirmative, and noted that rehabilitation alternatives would also include seismic retrofits of the existing structure to meet current standards. A resident suggested that the new bridge alternative might allow future rail use of the existing bridge. Jack Newick asked if the life spans were equal for both the rehabilitation alternatives and the new bridge alternative. Chris Waszczuk responded that the life spans were indeed equal. Gary Kassoff, USCG, stated that the GSB must have a current reuse, i.e., it cannot be preserved for a "probable future" use such as rail. A resident opined that if spending a lot of money is a given, then the new bridge is preferable.

Chris Waszczuk stated that cost is a major consideration. He noted that \$100 M is currently programmed in the 10-year Transportation Plan for the total project. If \$100 M is spent on the bridges, there will be no funds remaining for the roadway improvements. Chris reviewed the Summary Cost matrix of combined bridge alternatives noting the cost implications of the cable-stayed replacement bridge. Bill O'Donnell noted the range of rehabilitation alternative costs and the relatively high cost and minimum additional benefit of replacement bridge alternatives in comparison to the rehabilitation cost alternatives. In response to a question, Chris Waszczuk noted that the length of bridge was assumed to be the same as the existing structure for all cost estimates. In actuality, if the existing bridge were to be lengthened or a proposed replacement structure extended to improve the cross connection between the halves of Hilton Park, the bridge cost would increase accordingly. Bruce Woodruff added that cross connectivity at Hilton Park is important, as is no net loss of parkland. In response to a question, Frank O'Callaghan stated that costs of roadway alternatives are currently being updated and/or developed as the case may be. Steve Wells inquired as to what alternatives would be eliminated by endorsing the three bridge alternatives as proposed. Chris Waszczuk responded that the double decker rehabilitation, and the segmental concrete and steel girder replacement alternatives would be dropped. Steve Wells then moved that the ATF endorse the three (3) bridge alternatives as proposed. Without further discussion, the ATF unanimously endorsed advancing the three bridge alternatives, as proposed.

Chris Cross then initiated discussion of the roadway alternatives. With respect to Dover, Chris proposed advancing Alternatives 2 and 3. There was no further discussion, and the ATF unanimously endorsed Alternatives 2 and 3 to be advanced. Chris then noted the drawbacks to Alternative 6 in Newington – local connectivity and industrial area access. With respect to Alternatives 10 and 11, Steve Wells questioned whether there was adequate merge distance between the NB Exit 4 on-ramp and the LBB. Both Frank O'Callaghan and Mike Dugas responded that design of the on-ramp would allow sufficient distance for the on-ramp traffic to merge with the through traffic. John Burke inquired as to the benefit of the Tradeport connection to Exit 3. Frank responded that as the Tradeport is built out, over 500 peak hour trips from the north might enter and exit the Tradeport via Exit 3. He added that this access will serve to extend the service life of Exit 1, particularly during the weekday PM peak hour, by reducing the heavy volume of left-turns from Pease Boulevard headed NB onto the Turnpike. Maria Stowell requested that the location of the Tradeport connector be realigned to reduce potential impact on developable land abutting Aboretum Drive. Frank O'Callaghan will follow up. The owner of the Exxon service station located at the Nimble Hill Road intersection with the Turnpike expressed his concern that his business will be adversely affected due to the lack of access to the Turnpike under Alternatives 10 and 11. As proposed, site access would be restricted to the local roadway connecting Nimble Hill Road to Woodbury Avenue and Exit 3. Chris Waszczuk responded that provision of an off-ramp from the Turnpike to Nimble Hill Road – and access to the Exxon site – may be difficult to provide, but will be explored. With no further discussion, the ATF unanimously endorsed advancing Alternatives 10 and 11 with consideration of the Nimble Hill Road off-ramp, and the realignment of the Tradeport connector as discussed.

The next meeting of the ATF was tentatively scheduled for June 23, 2004 at Dover City Hall. Chris Cross thanked all in attendance for their interest and participation. He reminded all of the project website, www.newington-dover.com, as a means of staying in touch with the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.