Transportation
Land Development
Environmental
Services

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: Marlon Frink, Newington
Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT
Bruce Woodruff, Dover
Tom Fargo, SRPC
Jack Newick, Newington
Bill Oldenberg, NHDOT
Bill O'Donnell, FHWA
Steven Wells, COAST
Peter Wellenberger, NHF&G
Marc Laurin, NHDOT
Tim Roache, SRPC
Frank O'Callaghan, VHB
Howard Muise, VHB
Dave Wilcock, VHB
Peter Walker, VHB
Members of the Public

Date/Time: June 23, 2004

Project No.: 51425

Place: Dover City Hall

Re: Newington/Dover
ATF Meeting No. 7

Notes taken by: Peter Walker

The seventh meeting of the Newington Dover EIS project Advisory Task Force was held on June 23, 2004. The vice chair, Marlon Frink called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. The chairman of the ATF, Chris Cross had been detained and was not able to attend the beginning of the meeting.

Marlon reviewed the purpose and role of the Advisory Task Force (ATF). The ATF then reviewed the draft minutes from the previous ATF meeting. Marlon called for a motion and vote to accept the meeting minutes and they were accepted unanimously as submitted, with the abstention of Tom Fargo, who was not in attendance at the previous meeting. Marlon then turned the meeting over to Chris Waszczuk to provide an overview of the evening's agenda.

Chris provided an overview of the topics to be discussed, including a review of transportation demand management strategies (TDM) such as rail, bus, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) options, reversible lane options, and park and ride facilities. The meeting will include a review of the project team's recommendations for which alternatives should be carried forward into the DEIS. Finally, preliminary results from the environmental screening phase of the project would be discussed in the form of an "environmental constraints matrix." Chris emphasized the value of input from the ATF and public to the project team.

Frank O'Callaghan listed TDM strategies that are being considered by the project team. The alternatives were developed in coordination with the rail and bus operators in the region and regional planning staff. The project team had met with these agencies to understand the existing public transit infrastructure in the area and to discuss ideas for enhancing and improving transit. The goal of all the TDM alternatives is to reduce the volume of traffic on the Spaulding Turnpike in the project's study area. Once a preliminary list of transit options had been developed, the consulting team met again with representatives of the transit providers and the regional planning staffs to review the analysis of those options. Frank then described the alternatives.

RAIL ALTERNATIVES

Expansion of the Downeaster Service
The first rail alternative examined would involve expanding the Downeaster service by one train set. Currently, the Downeaster makes four round trips per day through the study area. However, only one of these trips coincides with the morning peak hour commuter time. Thus, the existing service is really not providing commuter service. By adding an additional train, it is expected that the service would be more convenient to commuters in the study area. The additional train set would run from Dover station to Boston during the weekday AM peak hour, and return from Boston during the PM peak hour. This alternative would require construction of a new layover facility in Dover in addition to the purchase of a new train set.

Based on a conceptual design, the infrastructure investment for this option is expected to cost between $11.5 and $17 million. The higher figure would allow the service to serve Rochester, rather than terminating in Dover. It was assumed that there will not be a need to double track the existing rail corridor to the Massachusetts state line. If double tracking is required, then the capital investment would increase to about $110-$115 million. Frank noted that these estimates (for all rail and transit alternatives) did not include operational costs.

Regional Commuter Rail Service
A second rail alternative would involve development of a new commuter rail line to carry passengers between Rochester and Portsmouth. This alternative would utilize the existing Conway Branch line south from Rochester and then run along the Main Line West to Dover. From Dover there are two (2) options: continuing along the MLW to Rockingham Junction, and then running east to Portsmouth along the Portsmouth Branch line; or running south from Dover on new right-of-way paralleling the Turnpike and crossing the channel to meet the Newington Branch Line.

Capital cost estimates for these options range from approximately $145 to $170 million. This would involve upgrading the existing rail lines, purchase of new train sets and construction of new train stations in Rochester, Somersworth, Newmarket and Portsmouth. The cost estimate does not include operational costs. Preliminary ridership estimates would result in less than 100 peak hour vehicles being removed from the Turnpike for the Rockingham Junction option, and less than 150 vehicles being removed from the more direct route paralleling the Turnpike.

Commuter/Tourist Service to Conway
A third rail option would involve extension/upgrade of rail service from Dover along the Conway Branch to Rochester and then north to Conway. This option assumes that the NHDOT may restore the 22-mile of missing track in Ossipee, and could be developed to handle freight service and also serve as a connection for tourists visiting the North Country or Boston. A preliminary cost estimate is approximately $40 million.

Frank explained that ridership numbers are very preliminary and that these rail options appear to remove approximately 50 to 150 peak hour vehicle trips from the Turnpike, a relatively low number in relation to the total traffic volume along the Turnpike.

Pease's Spur
A now inactive rail connection exists in Newington which runs from the industrial area on the south and east portion of the study area (the Newington Branch Line), across the Turnpike and then into the Pease Tradeport. The rail right-of-way is at-grade and was active when Pease was used as a military base. Frank pointed out that all of the Newington alternatives maintain a right-of-way corridor for future restoration of this rail service.

Marlon Frink asked Frank to put the estimated rail ridership numbers in the context of the total traffic in the corridor. Frank replied that, based on preliminary estimates, the rail alternatives would remove less than 150 peak hour vehicles from the Turnpike. Currently there's between 3,000 and 4,000 vehicles in the peak direction during the peak hours. That number is expected to increase to 5,000 - 6,000 per hour in the 2025 design year.

BUS ALTERNATIVES

Frank O'Callaghan then described the three (3) bus alternatives that had been developed and preliminarily assessed:

Expand Intercity Service (Rochester-Boston)
C & J Trailways currently operates a coach service between Dover and Boston via Portsmouth. This service could be expanded by adding coaches and extending the service area to Rochester. The cost of this alternative would be approximately $11.5 million in capital investment.

COAST Express Service
Frank explained that COAST plans to operate new express service between Rochester and Portsmouth along the Turnpike. This service is being funded through a CMAQ grant and is scheduled to begin in 2006. Frank explained that the express service could be further enhanced by adding Park and Ride facilities at Exit 9 in Dover and at Exit 12 in Rochester. The cost estimate for these Park and Rides is approximately $5 million. The Park and Rides would allow commuters a place to transfer between their private vehicles and the bus service, as well as support ride sharing and van-pooling.

Enhance Local Bus Service
Wildcat Transit and COAST, specifically COAST Route #2 (Rochester-Portsmouth), Wildcat Route #4 (Dover-Portsmouth) and COAST's Tradeport Trolley operate local bus routes in the study area. These services could be enhanced by adding additional buses to reduce headways and by providing an interconnection/transfer-point at Exit 1 which would allow riders to transfer among the local bus operators. In addition, a new Park and Ride facility could be constructed at the intersection of Route 108 and Route 4 in Durham, which would support the Wildcat #4 route, encourage ride sharing and van-pooling and allow the capture of some traffic that would otherwise go to or from the UNH campus. Capital cost for this enhancement is expected to be about $6.5 million.

There is some overlap among these bus alternatives. Therefore, if they were all bundled and implemented together, the capital cost of the entire package would be about $16 million. Preliminary analysis indicates that ridership for these bus alternatives would be approximately equal to the rail alternatives - at a fraction of the cost. Frank noted that analysis of ridership is on-going.

Peter Wellenberger commented that the newspaper has noted that the Downeaster ridership is down. This prompted Bruce Woodruff to reply that the ridership from Portland to Boston is down, but overall ridership on the Downeaster is up. It would therefore be a mis-statement to generalize that ridership is down. He also noted that COAST is expanding its local service in Dover.

Bruce encouraged the project team to look closely at local transit services. He noted that bus service will be ineffective if buses cannot get through congestion on the bridge. He recommended that consideration be given to utilizing the General Sullivan Bridge as an exclusive bus lane. He noted that moving traffic would be particularly important during construction. Marlon Frink commented that perhaps an exclusive bus lane could be used in combination with an HOV lane. Bruce reiterated that it would be particularly important to allow for an exclusive bus lane during construction. He felt that this could provide strong incentive for a shift in commuting behaviors in the area. Frank O'Callaghan replied that overall maintenance of traffic will be a challenge and that provision of an express bus lane would be an advantage if feasible.

Bruce believes that the issue is directly related to the fate of the General Sullivan Bridge. His understanding is that there is only a $5 million incremental cost to allow the General Sullivan to accommodate bus traffic. Chris Waszczuk explained that the rehabilitation of the General Sullivan Bridge would take at least one year and questioned whether the ATF would recommend that the General Sullivan Bridge be the first element of construction, or whether it is advisable to begin construction on the roadway first. Tom Fargo stated that the fate of the General Sullivan Bridge needs to be determined at the outset. Chris Waszczuk stated that the General Sullivan Bridge requires major rehabilitation, and there is, in fact, an $8 to 10 million incremental cost to accommodate buses.

Steve Wells asked Frank O'Callaghan how the consulting team had arrived at the cost estimates presented for TDM strategies. He pointed out that he believes that the express bus service can be implemented for far less than the $5 million figure quoted earlier by Frank. Frank clarified that the $5 million is actually the cost to design and construct Park and Rides at Exits 9 and 12. It does not include the capital cost and operation of the bus service. The express bus service is already funded and programmed for 2006.

Tom Fargo inquired as to the origin and destination used to predict ridership for the rail options, in particular the Downeaster alternative. Do the ridership figures assume a Dover to Boston trip? Frank confirmed that assumption. Tom stated that he was not surprised by the relatively low ridership estimates for the rail alternatives.

Marlon asked if it would be possible to summarize the alternative analysis in a table format. Chris Waszczuk replied that a matrix is being developed for that purpose and that information would be presented later in the discussion. Marlon asked if the DOT was looking to the ATF to make a recommendation on the alternatives. Chris replied that it was the Department's hope that the ATF would reach consensus this evening on the alternatives to be carried forward.

At this point in the discussion Marlon provided an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions or provide comment. There were no comments from the public attendees at this point.

HIGH OCCUPANCY/ REVERSIBLE LANES

Frank O'Callaghan explained that members of the public and the ATF had inquired about whether High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes could potentially reduce the scale of the future roadway and bridge infrastructure improvements. Frank explained that two main options for HOV lanes were examined in comparison to a standard 8-lane section. He used a graphic to illustrate the cross-section of each of the options. The first option would be a 2+2+2 lane cross section, with the center two lanes intended as HOV or reversible lanes. The total cross-section of this alternative would be approximately 132 feet. However, the results of the traffic modeling completed to date indicate that a minimum of three lanes in the off-peak direction during summer and fall peak hours would be needed to meet future travel demands. Therefore, this option is not being pursued.

A second HOV concept would involve a 3+1+3 lane cross-section. The center lane would be an HOV or a reversible lane. Frank explained that in order for HOV lanes to be efficient, they must be used by approximately 800 vehicles or more per peak hour. However, the traffic model predicts approximately 300 vehicles per hour would use the HOV lane assuming it would start at the Dover toll plaza and extend to I-95 in Portsmouth. Since potential traffic volumes would not justify this alternative, a second option was explored running from just south of Exit 6 to just north of Exit 1. This alternative would potentially maximize HOV ridership by extending HOV access to traffic from US 4, Dover Point Road, and the Tradeport. Unfortunately, given the compactness of the study area, the relatively short distance between Exits 6 and 1, and the relatively long lengths of roadway necessary to safely accommodate the merging and weaving of traffic to access and egress the HOV lane, this alternative was infeasible from a traffic safety and operation perspective. A third alternative was considered which assumed an HOV lane running from the Dover Toll Plaza to Exit 1. Similar to Alternative 1, the potential ridership estimate falls approximately 40% below the necessary threshold to justify its use.

In light of the infeasibility of HOV use, the 3+1+3 lane concept was tested from a reversible lane use perspective. Under this concept, the reversible lane would be utilized by the peak flow in the peak hour (i.e., southbound in the AM and northbound in the PM) and open to all vehicles. If this reversible lane extended from the Toll Plaza to Exit 1, approximately 1,500 vehicles per peak hour would use the lane, which is enough ridership to justify its use. Frank O'Callaghan explained that this 3+1+3 cross-section would be approximately 152 feet in cross-section due to the shoulders and barriers that would need to be constructed between the reversible lane and the other north and southbound lanes. He noted that this cross-section would actually be wider than the approximately 146 foot cross-section required for a typical 8-lane (4 NB and 4 SB) cross-section. As such, VHB concluded that the 3+1+3 reversible lane concept failed to offer a significant advantage over the traditional 8-lane cross-section -- the 3+1+3 cross section was greater in width, and the 3+1+3 presented additional operational and maintenance costs.

In response to the information presented by Frank, Marlon Frink commented that the larger cross-section associated with a 3+1+3 alternative would also likely increase the cost of the project. Frank pointed out that the 3+1+3 cross-section or any contra-flow option would also have additional operational costs related to plowing, policing and operating the HOV or reversible lane. Frank also pointed out that, because of the number and close spacing of interchanges in the 3.5 mile study area, one of the lanes is primarily functioning as an auxiliary lane for traffic merging from an on-ramp and diverging to an off-ramp, or for weaving traffic between interchanges.

At 7:45 PM, ATF Chair Chris Cross arrived.

Tom Fargo commented that the HOV/Reversible lane concepts do not make sense from a "Yankee thrift" perspective. He questioned why one would put jersey barriers where cars could otherwise travel. Marlon wondered whether it would be possible to operate an HOV/Reversible lane by putting the Jersey barrier on a rail such that it could be moved from one side to the other automatically. Bill O'Donnell pointed out that the HOV lane would require a break down lane, which would be used for disabled motorists and possible police enforcement. Marlon asked whether the bridge design would allow for the future conversion of the planned breakdown lanes to a travel lane. Frank O'Callaghan responded that some flexibility could be designed into the bridge layout.

Bruce Woodruff expressed the opinion that the 8-lane cross-section should be designed so that it could allow creation of an exclusive bus lane at some point in the future. Tom Fargo mentioned that he understood that several HOV lanes elsewhere in the country had recently been discontinued, since they were not adequately used.

Jack Newick had recently traveled in the Washington DC area and mentioned that HOV lanes are used extensively in that urbanized area. Bill O'Donnell suggested that HOV lanes can be controversial since they often are underutilized. He noted that many states investigate HOV use and subsequently drop the idea for any number of traffic operational and safety reasons. Chris Cross asked whether it would be possible to use the center median area of the 8-lane section as a Bus/HOV/Reversible lane at some point in the future. Frank O'Callaghan replied that this would certainly be possible. Bill O'Donnell pointed out that Federal Highway has standards for the design of roadway shoulders, but that some design exceptions are allowed under certain circumstances. Chris Cross suggested that the median cross-section should be designed wide enough to accommodate a future transit or HOV use.

Tim Roache, SRPC, requested that any new bridge allow a 10 to 12-foot lane for bike and pedestrian traffic if the General Sullivan Bridge is removed. Chris Waszczuk and Frank O'Callaghan replied that all bridge alternatives would accommodate pedestrian and bike traffic.

EMPLOYER-BASED TDM

Frank O'Callaghan reviewed employer-based TDM strategies that are possible and which would be assessed including: transit subsidies, ride sharing, vanpools, variable work hours, bike and pedestrian facilities, on-site amenities (daycare, cafeteria) and other measures.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS MATRIX

Frank O'Callaghan distributed a preliminary environmental constraints matrix to the ATF. He explained that the matrix attempts to summarize the major environmental, construction cost, and traffic related issues associated with each alternative. Bearing in mind that the current project phase is intended to provide an initial screening of alternatives and not a full impacts analysis, the matrix will help interested parties better understand the decision making process and the relative merits of each infrastructure alternative.

Frank reviewed some of the data from the draft matrix. For example, he pointed to the contrast between Dover roadway Alternatives 1 and 2, highlighting that Alternative 1 has greater wetland impact, as well as far greater property impacts and costs. He explained that some of the parameters that will be used and described in an environmental screening in the rationale report are qualitative. The data in the table should be regarded as preliminary and NHDOT and the consulting team are soliciting ATF comments on the contents and format of the matrix.

A general discussion of TDM feasibility followed.

Tom Fargo observed that it is often quite difficult for employees to vary their work hours, given that a working family's schedule is often set by daycare opportunities - that can preclude carpooling. He also pointed out employers typically do not provide lunch service on site and that forces many workers to bring a car to work. Frank O'Callaghan offered that there is some peak spreading at the Pease Tradeport due to the mix of land use -- office, R & D, light industry- and varying work schedules, and that some employers/tenants are now providing on-site cafeterias for employees.

Steve Wells stated that people will use a bus as an option if it runs frequently enough. Often the decision to use public transit is dictated by the type of job that a person holds. He noted that management and sales positions, which frequently need to travel, have a difficult time using public transportation. However, positions with set hours and a set location will typically have a much easier time using public transit. Jack Newick pointed out that there was excellent bus service in the seacoast

area when he was a young man and that over time service has declined. Marlon Frink observed that Americans are in love with their cars. Carpooling is underutilized and is not likely to be more fully utilized until there is a strong economic incentive to do so.

Tim Roache, SRPC, inquired whether the TDM ridership estimates had been analyzed in light of the operational improvements resulting from a wider highway. He suggested that TDM strategies should be analyzed under a constrained traffic-flow condition. Howard Muise, VHB, explained that the TDM alternatives had in fact been analyzed under a 3-lane (LOS E) constrained traffic flow condition. He suggested that if further analysis indicates that a 3-lane cross-section plus a combination of TDM strategies result in a Level-of-Service D traffic operation, then that may be a feasible strategy for the project. Bruce Woodruff stated that the bridge and Turnpike widening to address the 2025 needs should reflect planning for mobility needs beyond 2025. Chris Waszczuk stated that the EPA has requested an analysis of a 3-lane cross-section with TDM strategies. It was the consensus of the ATF that an 8-lane cross-section provides the flexibility to respond to safety and mobility needs beyond 2025 without further widening of the bridges and Turnpike.

ALTERNATIVES TO CARRY FORWARD

Bridge Alternatives
Bridge alternatives have been discussed during previous ATF meetings. However, the project team has concluded that all of the bridge options should limit bridge widening or replacement to the west of the existing Little Bay Bridges (LBB) to reduce impacts to Hilton Park and Bloody Point Cove.

Frank summarized the three main options which are recommended for further consideration:

1.) Westerly widening of the LBB with retention of the General Sullivan. Under this alternative, the General Sullivan Bridge would be rehabilitated to serve pedestrian and bike traffic.
2.) Westerly widening of the LBB with a new multi-use path (16' wide) on the widened bridge. This would involve removal of the General Sullivan Bridge.
3.) Construction of a new bridge to the west of the current Little Bay Bridge. This option could involve construction of a signature structure such as a cable-stayed or a concrete arch bridge. This alternative would also require removal of the General Sullivan Bridge, and provision of a multi-use path (16' wide) on the new bridge.

Roadway Alternatives
Frank O'Callaghan reviewed the roadway alternative that the project team is recommending be carried forward for further analysis in the draft EIS.

Alternatives 2 and 3 in Dover at Exit 6 are similar in many respects – both are characterized by 2-way traffic flow on the Turnpike overpass; a new diamond type interchange in the northbound direction which eliminates the westbound loop ramp to US 4 and includes a new northbound on-ramp; a grade- separated connection under the Turnpike linking the eastside and the westside of Hilton Park; and less property impacts, less wetland impact, and less construction cost than Alternative 1. The only significant difference between Alternatives 2 and 3 is the grade-separated connection under the Turnpike overpass and SB on-ramp from US 4 between Spur Road and Boston Harbor Road that is provided under Alternative 3.

Newington Alternatives 10, 11, and 12 have several common features – a major interchange at Exit 3 to consolidate the majority of the movements presently occurring at Exits 4, 3, and 2(NB); Tradeport roadway connection to Exit 3 and a future grade-separated rail right-of-way connection between the

Tradeport and the Newington Branch line; an industrial roadway connection between Shattuck Way and Exit 3; local roadway connection between Woodbury Avenue and Nimble Hill Road; elimination of the existing SB off-and on-ramps to Nimble Hill Road; and provision of NB off-and on-ramps to River Road. The major difference between Alternatives 10 and 11 is the location of the connector to Shattuck Way and the location of the railroad right-of-way for the future connection to the Tradeport. In Alternative 10, these parallel connections are provided between Exits 3 and 4. Under Alternatives 11, these two grade-separated connections are provided at Exit 3, paralleling Patterson Lane. Alternative 12 modifies Alternative 11 by simplifying the roadway connection from Woodbury Avenue and Exit 3 to the Tradeport, and by modifying the SB on-ramp from Exit 3 to reduce wetland impacts and increase weaving distance between the SB Exit 3 on-ramp and the SB Exit 1 off-ramp. Frank noted that Alternatives 10, 11, and 12 could be modified to provide a SB off-ramp to Nimble Hill Road.

Bill O'Donnell pointed out that Alternative 11 and 12 involve the reconstruction and grade-separated extension of Patterson Lane under the Turnpike. He asked if an at-grade connection to Woodbury Avenue had been considered? Chris Cross replied that Newington feels that the grade-separated connection is an important feature to segregate industrial and truck traffic from the Shattuck Way industrial area without using Woodbury Avenue.

Tom Fargo asked why the connection from Woodbury Avenue to Arboretum Drive under Alternative 12 was placed so far to the west. He suggested that the horizontal curve in that roadway section be tightened to bring the intersection to the south and east. Marlon initiated a discussion of using Fox Run Road as a connection into Pease as an alternative. Chris Cross confirmed that the Newington Planning Board strongly desires a grade separated industrial traffic connection in the general area. Tom Fargo asked whether some of the large radius curves in Alternative 11 and 12 might be tightened up to decrease the footprint of these alternatives. Frank O' Callaghan suggested that the topography, grades and spacing required between ramps and the local roadway intersections determine the curvature and alignment of the connections. He indicated that VHB would review the alignment and design requirements

TSM ALTERNATIVES

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (TSM)

Frank O'Callaghan then reviewed four TSM projects that had been previously discussed and endorsed by the ATF. Each of the following is recommended to be carried forward in the DEIS.

Dover TSM 1
Extension of the NB deceleration lane to the loop ramp leading to US 4 at Exit 6. Restriping of the shoulder area under the overpass will extend the deceleration lane by approximately 400' without impacting the bridge abutment. This measure will prevent peak hour exiting traffic backing up from the loop ramp onto the Turnpike from blocking NB through traffic on the Turnpike.

Dover TSM 2
This action involves 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 (2) through lanes on the Turnpike through the Exit 6 interchange to merge with the single SB on-ramp. Currently, the 2-through lanes merge to a single lane. The proposed changes will make it safer and easier for drivers to be in the proper lanes (either inside or outside) when planning to exit at Nimble Hill Road or Woodbury Avenue.

Interim Safety Plan (Newington)
The Interim Safety Plan will address the current safety and traffic operational problems at Nimble Hill Road and at River Road due to inadequate weaving distances between these roadways and the median SB to NB turnaround on the Turnpike. By providing a two-way, grade-separated connection under the Turnpike, between Nimble Hill Road and River Road, the median turnaround can be eliminated, thus making the current weaving conditions unnecessary. The existing SB on-ramp from the grade-separated turnaround from River Road is also eliminated which removes another safety and traffic operational problem. This project is under final design and scheduled for construction in 2005.

Other Newington TSM Actions
Upon completion of the Interim Safety Plan, the SB deceleration lane to Woodbury Avenue can be extended to provide improved operations. In addition, a NB auxiliary lane can be developed between Woodbury Avenue and River Road to provide a better merging and weaving condition for traffic exiting the Turnpike from Woodbury Avenue and for traffic exiting at River Road. The NB project will be included as part of the Interim Safety Project.

While reducing the level of traffic turbulence and improving the safety of current traffic operations on both sides of the bridges, Frank reminded all that the basic capacity constraints of the bridges and Turnpike remain, resulting in peak hour congestion and vehicular delay.

SUMMARY

Frank summarized the TDM alternatives which are recommended for further study as follows:

- Expansion of the Downeaster Rail service between Dover and Boston assuming double tracking to the MA line is unnecessary.
- Preservation of the Pease rail spur connection.
- Expansion of intercity bus service between Rochester, Portsmouth and Boston.
- Enhancement of express bus between Rochester and Portsmouth.
- Enhancement of the local bus service, specifically COAST Route 2, Wildcat Transit Route 4, and the Tradeport Trolley Service.
- All employer-based measures.

Tim Roache, SRPC, commented that he assumed that a bike/pedestrian connection would be carried forward as part of the TDM package. Frank O'Callaghan confirmed that bike and pedestrian connections would be incorporated into bridge and roadway alternatives.

Chris Waszczuk solicited input on the list of recommend alternatives. The consensus of ATF was that the list of recommended alternatives to carry forward was appropriate. Jack Newick commented that the list seems "on the mark." Marlon Frink concurred.

SCHEDULE

Frank O'Callaghan reviewed some upcoming dates. He pointed out that there will be public information meetings on June 30th in Dover and on July 1st in Newington. The next ATF meeting is scheduled for August 25, 2004 in Newington.

Marlon solicited any further discussion from the ATF or public. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM.