



**Meeting
Notes**

Attendees: Chris Cross, ATF Chair, RPC
Steve Parkinson, Portsmouth
Rick Card, Greater Dover Chamber
of Commerce
Bruce Woodruff, Dover
Leon Kenison, PDA
Tom Fargo, SRPC
Jack Newick, Dover
Sandy Hislop, Newington
Bill O'Donnell, FHWA
Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT
Marc Laurin, NHDOT
Mike Dugas, NHDOT
Tim Roache, SRPC
David Walker, RPC
Jim Hicks, RKG Associates
Pete Walker, VHB
Jake Tinus, VHB
Frank O'Callaghan, VHB

Date/Time: August 24, 2005 / 6:30 PM

DRAFT

Project No.: 5142500

Place: Dover City Hall

Re: Newington-Dover 11238
ATF Meeting No. 14

Notes taken by: Frank O'Callaghan
Jake Tinus

Chris Cross called the meeting to order at 6:38 pm. He welcomed all, introduced the ATF members and described the ATF's role in reviewing the Spaulding Turnpike Improvement Project. Chris then described the status of the project, indicating that this is the 14th ATF meeting to be held. He indicated that information pertaining to the project is available on the website: www.newington-dover.com. Chris then referred to the draft July 6, 2005 ATF meeting minutes and asked the ATF members if they had any notations aside from the spelling of a Newington selectman's name, which was corrected. A motion was made, and seconded, to accept the minutes as amended. Chris then took the opportunity to compliment VHB for their role as consulting engineers on the project. He also complimented Frank O'Callaghan for a job well done on meeting minutes; he stated that Newington officials noted the thoroughness and accuracy of the information contained in the public record.

Chris Waszczuk then shared the contents of a letter dated July 26, 2005 from the Town of Newington and read the letter for the record. The letter indicates that the elevation of the Turnpike is of greatest concern to the Town and Alternative 13, which proposes a depressed Turnpike is preferred over Alternatives 10A and 12A as Alternatives 10A and 12A would elevate the Turnpike and result in substantially more noise impacts to Town residents. The letter also requests that concepts for an

elevated turnpike are rejected. Chris asked that the letter be officially added to the minutes, but expressed concern that Alternative 13 was not specifically noted as the preferred alternative by the Town. He also noted that the preliminary noise studies completed to date do not show a severe noise impact to the Newington residential area with either alternative. He expressed hope, as Phase 3 was nearing completion, that a preferred alternative would be identified, and that the City of Dover officials would provide a clear expression of either their support for a preferred alternative or clear direction for the project.

Bill O'Donnell pointed out that he too thought that the last paragraph of the Town of Newington's letter was not specific enough to demonstrate Newington's support for Alternative 13. Chris Cross agreed that the Town of Newington appeared to have taken a "light approach" to the letter and noted that the Town views Alternative 13 as the most viable configuration. Chris explained that Newington's biggest concern appears to be potential noise from the highway. In his view, Town officials desire the lowest noise level at the least project cost. He stated that he has asked selectmen for clarification and an endorsement of a preferred alternative in Newington. Regarding the letter from Newington, Chris Waszczuk asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the ATF. There being none, Chris reviewed the meeting agenda which includes a discussion of indirect and cumulative impacts, a review of the Dover alternatives, and a summary of impacts to wetlands and potential mitigation for the project.

Jim Hicks, RKG Associates, introduced himself and explained that RKG's role was to provide an assessment of the various social and economic factors that are being considered in the impact analysis *vis-à-vis* the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared for the project. He continued that he was going to explain the preliminary direct, indirect and cumulative socio-economic impacts to the project. He noted that **Direct Impacts** are caused by the proposed action, or project, and occur at the same time and place. **Indirect Impacts** are caused by the project and are later in time or further removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. **Cumulative Impacts** result from incremental impact of the project when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or persons undertake such action. Jim went on to explain the methodology used to analyze social and economic trends of the study area, which includes Strafford county and portions of Rockingham and Carroll counties. As such, the data that he would refer to was adjusted to reflect these geophysical and demographic realities.

Jim reviewed his methodology. Following the identification of the 33-community study area, social and economic trends were evaluated and complemented by utilizing the regional economic and policy model (REMI) to forecast key economic changes. Additional project changes related to 6 and 8-lane bridge/highway widening alternatives were also estimated by utilization of the REMI TranSight model, which links transportation improvements and economic output.

Jim summarized the key social and economic trends occurring in the study area. These trends include substantial growth in housing over the past 20 to 30 years, with a decline in the rate of growth during the 1990's. In Strafford County, population growth exceeded that in Rockingham. Overall, the study area is projected to experience approximately 28% growth between 2000 and 2025. The average number of residential building permits was approximately 1,400 between 1985 and 2002, with approximately 1 permit in 5 involving multi-family dwelling units. Average housing prices were lower in Strafford County than in Rockingham County between 1992 and 2002. Jim also pointed out that employment in the area showed a 27% increase from 1993 to 2001, and that about 74% of workers that live in the study area are employed in the study area. The analysis also shows that Strafford County saw a 20% increase in the number of residents that work outside the county. In

Rockingham County, about 65% of the workers that commute work in Rockingham County, with only 6% traveling to Strafford County for work.

Regarding direct socio-economic impacts from the project, Jim explained that only two or three properties, depending on the combination of project alternatives that are chosen, would be impacted. He also pointed out that the various alternatives result in a reduction in property tax revenue of less than 1% in both Dover and Newington.

With respect to indirect impacts, Jim explained that the evaluation process includes first developing a base model reflecting a "no build" scenario. From this, the socio-economic effects of various build alternatives are developed. Specifically, Jim mentioned that each of the three alternatives in Newington could improve access to the Pease International Tradeport and a 16-acre parcel (the former drive-in theatre site) in Newington. He further stated that minimal impacts are expected to existing businesses other than at the ExxonMobil service station at Nimble Hill Road. However, providing limited or full access to the Turnpike from Nimble Hill Road may minimize this impact. Positive impacts related to increasing connectivity between certain neighborhoods in Newington and Dover was also noted.

Jim then presented a series of tables showing 2005 statistics on population, employment, economic output and disposable income in Strafford and Rockingham counties and projecting (2025) how they would change over time. For example, population growth in Strafford and Rockingham counties is projected to grow by 22,133 (0.9%/year) and 70,653 (1.2%/year), respectively, without improving the Turnpike in Newington and Dover. He also noted that peak travel times between Exits 1 and 6 on the Turnpike would change in the study area over time depending on whether or not the Turnpike is widened to either 6 or 8-lanes. For example, under the No-Build condition, the existing weekday northbound PM peak hour average vehicle travel time between Exits 1 and 6 will increase from approximately 10 minutes (2005) to 20 minutes in 2025. Assuming widening of the Little Bay Bridges and Turnpike, current travel times would be reduced by approximately 3 minutes under the 6-lane build alternative, and by approximately 6 minutes under the 8-lane build alternative.

Jim concluded his discussion of indirect impacts by summarizing the key changes that would occur due to various alternatives by 2025. He stated that if no improvements are undertaken (no build alternative), population would increase by 50,000 persons within the study area, and the number of households would increase by approximately 21,000. Under the 6-lane bridge alternative, Jim explained that by 2025, a relatively small increase in the number of households and population would occur, 450 and 1,350, respectively, with employment increasing by approximately 1,330 persons above the no build condition. Assuming the 8-lane alternative, increases of approximately 600 households, 1,860 in population, and 1,900 in employment above the no-build condition, could be expected.

Regarding cumulative impacts, Jim mentioned additional development at Pease International Tradeport of approximately 1.5 million square feet and the planned Liberty Mutual expansion of an additional 2,000 employees in Dover. Jim pointed out the general trend toward retail decentralization as a result of a growing population. He also pointed out that the New Hampshire Seacoast Wastewater Management Study may recommend the expansion of public sewerage, which could also affect future growth in the study area by permitting denser development.

At this point, Jim paused for questions and comments. Tom Fargo inquired as to the REMI model inputs, specifically asking if the aging of the population was reflected in the socio-economic growth

projections. Jim confirmed that the model reflects the aging of the “baby boomers”. Tom followed up with a rhetorical question, suggesting that some people may believe that if the bridges and Turnpike are not widened, there will be little to no growth in the socio-economic study area. To the contrary, Jim replied, an increase of approximately 50,000 in population is expected in the study area by 2025 under the No Build condition. Widening to 6 or 8-lanes will increase study area population above the no build condition by approximately 1,357 (2.7%) and 1,860 (3.7%) people, respectively. 2025 employment increases above the No Build condition range from approximately 1,331 (6-lane widening) to 1,900 (8-lane widening). Jim further noted that the lower cost of housing in Strafford county, in comparison to Rockingham county, is the driving force, and while the rate of growth is higher in Strafford county, the absolute numbers, *vis-à-vis* population, households, and employment are relatively low.

John Scruton, 99 Sixth Street, Dover, expressed concern about the amount of land that has been lost at Hilton Park over time. He asked how much parkland would be impacted by the project. He also asked whether a tunnel could be built to connect the two portions of Hilton Park on either side of the Turnpike. Frank O’Callaghan responded that the current alternatives being considered for the project would not result in any impacts at Hilton Park. He also pointed out that if there were impacts, NHDOT would have to mitigate for those impacts. Frank added that Hilton Park could be connected and he would discuss the connection in a few minutes within the context of describing the Dover alternatives.

Tom Withka asked about current study area travel times and delays. Frank O’Callaghan explained that currently, between Exit 1 and Exit 6, it takes approximately 9 to 10 minutes to travel that distance during weekday evening peak hours. He noted that under the 2025 No Build condition, such travel time would double. Additionally, the peak “hour” would spread to approximately 3.5 hours. Tom Fargo pointed out that these travel times relate to “non-incident” times. Frank concurred adding that with an accident or vehicle breakdown, traffic quickly backs up, increasing traffic congestion throughout the study area.

There being no further questions or comments, Frank O’Callaghan described the two proposed alternatives in Dover – Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. He referred to a conceptual plan of Alternative 2 and noted the common elements of both alternatives: a grade-separated Hilton Park connector, closure of Exit 5, reconfiguration of the Exit 6 NB off-ramp to a signalized diamond interchange, closure of the Boston Harbor Road access ramp to the SB Exit 6 on-ramp, closure of the Cote Drive Turnpike access, conversion of the Turnpike overpass to 2-way traffic flow, and construction of a new NB on-ramp at Exit 6. Frank then described the changes in traffic patterns associated with these infrastructure modifications. He stated that there has been to date a lot of discussion about the proposed signalized diamond-type NB off-ramp, in comparison to the concept of converting the existing single lane loop ramp [that currently accommodates the NB to WB traffic flow to the Scammell Bridge] to a 2-lane loop ramp as would be warranted by future 2025 travel demands. With respect to the proposed signalized diamond-type off-ramp, Frank noted that peak hour traffic operations would be satisfactory and that vehicle queuing back from the signal would be contained on the off-ramp and would not spill back onto the Turnpike. Signal operations at the off-ramp would provide gaps in the Dover Point Road/overpass traffic stream which would make it easier for traffic to exit and enter Dover Point Road located to the east of the off-ramp. In addition, WB traffic turning left from the off-ramp will not be required to stop at the traffic signal located at the US 4/SB on-ramp intersection. In contrast to the signalized diamond-type off-ramp proposal, the alternative of a 2-lane loop ramp (free flow conditions) raises safety and traffic operational concerns, would require a wider and longer structure to overpass the Turnpike thus increasing construction costs by approximately \$2 M, and results in a NB on-ramp location and layout which would be blocked by vehicles queued back from the Dover toll plaza during the weekday PM peak hour. As

such, the project design team remains unconvinced of the merits of the 2-lane loop ramp concept, and recommends the signalized diamond-type NB off-ramp be retained under both Alternatives 2 and 3.

With respect to Alternative 3, Frank noted that a grade-separated connector (under the overpass) would be provided connecting Spur Road with Boston Harbor Road. This would eliminate the need for a traffic signal at the Boston Harbor Road/Spur Road intersection and would provide a local connection (separate from US 4) connecting the residential areas of Spur Road and Boston Harbor Road. (Turns would be restricted to right in/right out). He also identified the two direct impacts of the Dover alternatives (mentioned earlier by Jim Hicks) as K-9 Kaos and Adaptations, both located on Dover Point Road.

A resident asked why the access ramp from Boston Harbor Road to the SB on-ramp is being closed. Frank responded that ramp geometry limits entering traffic from Boston Harbor Road to low speeds. With the 2025 SB on-ramp traffic volume increasing by approximately 60 percent in the weekday AM peak hour, the merging of the low volume, and low speed traffic from Boston Harbor Road with the heavier volume of relatively high speed traffic from US 4 will result in poor traffic operations and a potentially dangerous merge condition. A safer alternative (with minimum inconvenience) is the rerouting of the Dover Point Road and Boston Harbor Road traffic to turn right at the Boston Harbor Road/US 4 intersection and then to turn right again to enter the SB on-ramp.

Frank then reviewed the profile of the Turnpike noting the proposed Hilton Park connector (under the Turnpike) located approximately 1,200' north of the channel. He noted that an alternative location abutting the channel had been considered, but was deemed infeasible due to floodplain and parkland impacts; such an alternative would also result in additional construction costs of approximately \$5.5 M (to extend the Little Bay and General Sullivan Bridges by one span). He also reviewed preliminary engineering studies of elevating the Hilton Park connector over the Turnpike at the proposed connector location (approximately 1,200' north of the channel). Such an alternative would allow the profile of the Turnpike to remain at its existing elevation. He noted that maximizing the grades on the connector road (but no steeper than 8 percent) and providing the minimum vertical clearance (16'-6") required over the Turnpike could not avoid causing additional property impacts along Dover Point Road to meet grade on Dover Point Road. As such, the concept of elevating the connector road was dropped from further consideration.

With respect to the alternative of providing the connector road adjacent to the channel, Bruce Woodruff asked if the analysis considered the option of removing the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB). Such an option might reduce or eliminate potential impacts to the park. Frank responded that removal of the GSB was not reflected in the analyses to date. Bruce added that, based on the discussion of alternatives and review of traffic patterns, he had a better understanding of the future traffic operations of Exit 6.

Jack Newick concurred with the safety concerns associated with recommending the closure of the Boston Harbor Road ramp connection to the Exit 6 SB on-ramp noting that elderly drivers comprise a part of this ramp-to-ramp traffic. He also noted that the proposed connector roadway must accommodate trucks. Bruce Woodruff added that hauling of boats with masts must also be accommodated. Sandy Hislop stated that 14' mast height would be necessary; masts higher than 14' could be lowered or broken down for clearance. As such, the proposed 14'-6" clearance for the connector, as proposed traversing under the Turnpike, will be adequate.

Rick Sirois from Dover Point Road inquired whether all the traffic from Hilton Park would be rerouted to Dover Point Road. He asked if this issue has been studied and wanted to know if noise and dust in the neighborhood would increase during construction. He asked whether a berm could be built to mitigate these concerns. Frank O'Callaghan responded that the rerouting of traffic has been reflected in the analysis of future conditions. Chris Waszczuk stated that noise impacts were being assessed and that conceptual noise mitigation will be addressed at the next ATF meeting and upcoming Public Information Meetings.

Rick Hebert introduced himself as a user of the roads which are going to be improved by the project. He pointed out several examples of other roads in the region where double turning lanes are operational. Rick emphasized that he was opposed to traffic lights. He challenged the design team to develop an alternative that eliminates traffic signals. Frank O'Callaghan responded that he agrees that there are numerous examples of dual turning lanes, but these left turning lanes are controlled by traffic signals. Frank pointed out the NB exiting vehicles traveling west to US 4 might stop at the off-ramp signal, but would never be required to stop at the SB on-ramp signal, and under Alternative 3, would travel free flow from the NB off-ramp to the Scammell Bridge. In reality, there is only one traffic signal for the NB to WB traffic flow.

Ray Bardwell of Spur Road stated that the design team is to be commended for their fine work in designing the highway improvements considering the limited ROW and compactness of the Exit 6 area. That said, he believes that the WB loop ramp could be enhanced by adding a second lane to it. He further believes that trucks will impede the efficiency of double left turns under the proposed diamond configuration. Lastly, he stated his opposition to traffic signals and asked why the Exit 5 on-ramp from Hilton Park couldn't remain. Chris Waszczuk replied that Alternative 3 was developed in part to eliminate excess signalization as discussed above. Regarding a two-lane loop ramp, Chris reiterated NHDOT's concerns with traffic operations and safety. Regarding the closure of Exit 5, Frank O'Callaghan stated that the proximity of the Exit 5 on-ramp to the Exit 6 off-ramp, given the increase in 2025 travel demands, precludes the safe operation of traffic weaving between entering at Exit 5 and exiting at Exit 6. (Additionally, acceptable geometry at Exit 5 simply cannot be provided without substantial impacts to Hilton Park or the Wentworth Terrace neighborhood.)

Bruce Woodruff noted that the problem in the Exit 6 area is that there is not a lot of available land to work with. If the land area were available, a cloverleaf interchange could be built. The loop ramp issue was looked at in Alternative 1, and it resulted in the loss of several residential properties. This was deemed unacceptable by the City. Frank O'Callaghan confirmed that if a two-lane loop were constructed, standards would dictate that the radius of the loop be enlarged thus resulting in additional impacts to residences. He explained that the design approach retains the existing Exit 6 configuration to the extent possible, while improving the roadway capacity and safety and minimizing environmental and property impacts.

Ray Bardwell asked if it were possible to construct an off-ramp to Spur Road in the vicinity of where it used to be located (i.e. immediately west of the Dover Point Road bridge over the Turnpike). Frank O'Callaghan pointed out that this was not possible due to the grade differences, limited space available, and potential impacts. Tom Fargo added that there would be potential impacts to wetlands and public conservation lands north of this location.

Rick Hebert questioned the need for the proposed Exit 6 NB on-ramp. Chris Waszczuk replied that the off-ramp is relatively inexpensive and allows more people to access the highway directly, which would reduce circuitous and unnecessary traffic volumes on the Turnpike and local roadways.

Tom Fargo reiterated his preference for locating the Dover Point connector road in proximity to the channel, if possible. He questioned whether or not the potential impact to parkland could be avoided if the GSB were either removed or rehabilitated for pedestrian/bicycle use only and the approach to the bridge narrowed. The project team will re-examine connector options at the channel both with and without the GSB.

Chris Cross asked if there were any additional questions. As there were none, the floor was turned over to Pete Walker to provide a summary of the potential wetland impacts and details on preliminary wetland mitigation. He explained that because the project will impact wetlands, NHDOT has to assess the wetlands in the project area and describe the impacts. He stated that from a permitting standpoint, wetlands can be one of the more significant issues in a project of this magnitude. Pete then spoke about the potential project impacts and said that because preliminary impacts have been estimated, they would be updated as designs undergo further refinement.

Pete summarized the impacts to Dover wetlands that would result from Alternative 3 and the Westerly Bridge Rehabilitation. Impacts include both palustrine (fresh water) and estuarine (tidal influenced) wetlands. He stated that in Dover the impacts to wetlands would be between 4 and 5 acres, and in Newington, impacts are about 2.5 times greater or between 11 and 12 acres.

Pete then explained the regulatory framework governing wetland protection. In New Hampshire, NHDES oversees wetlands and requires mitigation for certain wetland impacts. NHDES favors mitigation within the same watershed where possible, has established ratios for specific types of mitigation [e.g. 10 Ac of preservation per 1 Ac of wetland impact] and favors wetlands preservation. At the Federal level, the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) has jurisdiction by way of the Clean Water Act Section 404, and that ACOE cooperatively reviews projects with EPA, USFWS, and NMFS. As a matter of practice, the ACOE does not require specific mitigation ratios, although they have required specific compensation amounts for certain projects. The ACOE typically prefers restoration, then preservation, and allows creation in some cases.

Pete described recent examples and types of wetland mitigation – creation (Brentwood), restoration (Rye Harbor) and preservation (Tilton) – projects in New Hampshire. He also described the methodology and process to identify suitable mitigation parcels. The first step is to assemble GIS layers that show existing conserved lands and wetlands. Next, numerous existing publications and reports were reviewed and consultations were made with respective Conservation Commissions, the Nature Conservancy and Regulatory Agencies. Finally, parcels identified to have mitigation potential were field reviewed by biologists skilled in performing these types of assessments. He then described the possible mitigation sites in Dover.

Referring to a map that was distributed to attendees, Pete described the Blackwater Brook site (DR-8) located along the Rochester municipal boundary. He explained that this site was the preferred site for mitigation in Dover, as it would provide a preservation opportunity that Dover and the Nature Conservancy both favor. The site is undeveloped with a variety of upland and wetland habitat that is connected to existing conservation land. Blackwater Brook flows through the site from the east and drains to the Bellamy River. If selected for mitigation, NHDOT would conserve 40 to 50 acres of property, or approximately 10 times the 4-5 Ac project wetland impact in Dover.

Pete then described the remaining parcels, which include the Bellamy River (DR-4) site, Johnson Creek (DR-11) and Varney Brook sites. He stated that the Bellamy River site is less desirable as it is comprised mostly of wetlands and has encroaching development around it. Because it is mostly wet, the property is essentially “protected” from development. The Johnson Creek (DR-11) site is limited by the residential development that surrounds it. Use of the Varney Brook site for mitigation would involve upgrading culverts and removing invasive species. Pete indicated that such efforts might be more complicated than the ecological benefit and cost; as such, this site was not being recommended.

In Newington, Pete explained that restoration was being considered as the primary form of mitigation. In total, 18 sites have been reviewed, with 10 sites appropriate for restoration, and eight suitable for preservation and limited creation opportunities. With regard to restoration, the highest priority site includes the Flagstone Brook/Railway Brook/Pickering Brook stream system (NN-4/NN-8) and the adjacent former Drive-in Theatre site. Pete described the stream system as consisting largely of a straightened channel with heavy sediment loading. Although the stream is quite degraded, it is located within a land area that is considered high value for wildlife. Regarding the former Drive-in property, Pete explained that NHDOT might use the parcel during construction for staging, and that when complete, could potentially restore and preserve a portion of, or all of, this property in association with stream restoration. As for the Coastal Ponds that border the Piscataqua River, initial evaluation suggests that restoration of the ponds would involve dredging the ponds. After a field review, it was determined that the lower pond is actually in good health as it receives regular tidal flushing. The upper pond has now reverted largely to marsh as it has become laden with sediments. As such, it is now providing important water quality functions for Pickering Brook, which flows through it.

Pete then summarized the attributes and limitations of the remainder of the potential sites in Newington. He explained that some of these sites are less desirable or not recommended for further consideration for a number of reasons. With respect to preservation opportunities, the Knight Brook site (NN-3) and the Watson properties located near Fox Point and Tricky’s Cove, respectively, were identified during earlier study efforts as opportunities to expand on existing conservation land located nearby. The Knight Brook property was field reviewed and consists of a variety of habitat including forest, wetland, and agricultural fields. The Watson properties have not yet been field reviewed.

The following sites were mentioned by Pete as being initially considered, but upon further assessment, are not likely to be pursued further. Paul Brook was thought to represent an opportunity for stream restoration, but upon field inspection, was determined to have limited opportunities, as the stream is in relatively good condition, considering its landscape amidst commercial and industrial development. Pete mentioned that it might be possible to restore the so-called “unnamed stream”, but because of its location amidst extensive commercial development (i.e. pavement and buildings), restoration opportunities might be limited to improving storm water BMPs in upgradient areas that drain to the stream. With regard to Hodgson Brook, this stream is the focus of a current stream corridor study, so any opportunity for restoration will be identified (and undertaken separately from this project) when the study is complete. He also indicated that the circumneutral swamp site (NN-6), located in the northwest quadrant of the Exit 1 (Gosling Road) interchange, consists mostly of wetland, with very limited additional property available for preservation. As such, it was likely that no further action would be taken with this site.

Pete concluded his presentation of specific sites in Newington by describing the remaining locations, which include McIntyre Brook (NN-1, NN-2), Stubbs Pond, Thomas Family Tracts, and the Fabyan Point site. McIntyre Brook includes restoration opportunities similar to

Flagstone/Railway/Pickering Brook, while the latter two sites might be opportunities for preservation. (The Thomas Family Tracts and Fabyan Point sites have not yet been field reviewed.) Stubbs Pond is currently the focus of an environmental restoration project (by others), so no further action will be pursued at this time.

Pete closed by suggesting that, assuming Resource Agency concurrence, the appropriate mitigation package may generally emphasize wetland preservation in Dover, and wetland restoration in Newington. He then reviewed the next steps in the process for assembling an appropriate mitigation package. These include: a field walk with Resource Agencies scheduled for September 13, 2005; follow-up with communities; the development of a formal proposal in the Draft EIS; preparation and filing of an ACOE Individual Permit; and preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Following Pete's presentation, Tom Fargo, speaking as Chairman of the Strafford Regional Planning Commission Executive Committee and Dover Conservation Commission, stated that he strongly supports the recommendation to protect and preserve the Blackwater Brook site (DR-8). He noted that Dover is currently securing easements in the vicinity of a water supply well located to the east of the Turnpike, and also to the south of Blackwater Brook. Tom also stated that the City is working with landowners of the parcels that comprise the Bellamy Brook site (DR-4). He stated that, if possible, Dover would like to partner with NHDOT in preserving this site.

John Scruton asked whether anyone has considered the possibility of not building the bridge, but focusing instead on advancing outreach efforts and incentives to encourage ride sharing, carpooling, etc. Also, Mr. Scruton inquired why information on the Newington portion of the project is being presented in Dover. Frank O'Callaghan responded that employer-based TDM programs are in fact being considered as part of this on-going study. Expanded transit and ride-sharing programs will be part of the total improvement program and will have a positive effect on air quality in the highway corridor; however, such programs would not, in and of themselves, preclude the need to widen the Little Bay Bridges and Turnpike. With regard to presenting Newington information at this evening's meeting hosted in Dover, Chris Cross explained that it is appropriate information for the entire project at every ATF meeting, regardless of location, since the project affects portions of each community. Chris added that the ATF represents local and regional stakeholders, including representatives from Dover and Newington, and acts as a liaison between the project proponents and the public at large. Meetings are scheduled alternately in Dover and Newington for the convenience of residents, not to limit or focus discussion on a single community.

Chris Cross thanked all for attending the meeting. He noted that Phase 3 of the study is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year (2005). The goal is to have a preferred alternative, endorsed by the ATF, to present at Public Information Meetings later this fall. (Public Informational meetings are presently scheduled for November 7th in Dover and November 9th in Newington). The next ATF meeting has been re-scheduled for October 26th, 2005 at Newington Town Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.