



**Meeting
Notes**

Attendees: Chris Cross, ATF Chairman, RPC
Bruce Woodruff, Dover
Jack Newick, Dover
Maria Stowell, PDA
Sandy Hislop, Newington
Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT
Marc Laurin, NHDOT
Bill Oldenberg, NHDOT
Bob Landman, Seacoast MPO
David Walker, RPC
Tim Roache, SRPC
Frank O'Callaghan, VHB
Peter Wellenberger, GBERR
Members of the Public

Date/Time: 3/30/05

Project No.: 5142500

Place: Re: Newington-Dover 11238
ATF Meeting No. 11

Notes taken by: Frank O'Callaghan

Chris Cross, ATF Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:37 PM. He welcomed all and noted that the Advisory Task Force (ATF) and project team were looking for community input. He explained that the evening's agenda included follow-up on several issues that were discussed at the previous ATF meeting (2/23/05). Chris explained that as each agenda item was presented, there would be opportunity for questions and comments from the ATF, followed by questions and comments from the public. He also noted that written comments or questions could be submitted to Chris Waszczuk following the meeting either by mail or via the project website – www.newington-dover.com, and that Chris would respond and follow-up. The ATF members, Bob Landman and David Walker then introduced themselves.

The draft ATF meeting minutes of February 23, 2005 were then reviewed. There being no comments, the draft meeting minutes were unanimously approved by the ATF. Chris Cross noted that Dave Parkinson would replace John Burke as the City of Portsmouth's representative on the ATF due to John's imminent relocation from New Hampshire to Illinois. Chris Waszczuk then thanked all for coming out and attending the meeting. He stated that at the last ATF meeting (2/23/05), he announced that review comment letters on the Rationale Report had been received from the ACOE, USEPA, the SRPC and the City of Dover. The letters generally concurred on the reasonableness of the range of alternatives that were being carried forward for further study; he added that it would have been better to have received more comments on matters of concurrence. He noted that engineering and environmental studies were on-going as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and that the project team continues to seek comment and input from both resource agencies and the public. He then requested Frank O'Callaghan to briefly review the comments received to

date, and the status of the project team's response, noting that some comments will require further discussion.

Frank began by noting that the Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE) concurred with the reasonableness of the range of alternatives being carried forward. The USEPA also concurred with the range of alternatives being studied. The EPA encouraged consideration of combining infrastructure upgrade alternatives with TSM, TDM and Transit alternatives. They expressed concern over future peak hour operations at the Dover Toll facility. Frank noted that VHB had developed several computer model simulations of 2025 peak hour conditions, and that he would address this issue later in the agenda. The EPA expressed disappointment that a separate mesoscale (daily) air quality analysis of ozone precursors for the project area would not be conducted as part of the study. Frank responded that a regional mesoscale analysis had been recently conducted by the Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC) and would be updated by the RPC this year. Dave Walker confirmed that the Rockingham Planning Commission is currently updating the mesoscale air quality analysis for the Seacoast region. Frank added that the Newington-Dover project would conduct a microanalysis of potential CO hot spots. The EPA comments concluded with a recommendation that NHDOT require diesel retrofits and use of low sulphur fuels as part of the future construction specifications. Frank noted that the NHDOT would require all contractors to meet federal and state requirements at the time of construction.

The Strafford Regional Planning Commission (SRPC) commented that the Newington-Dover project is the highest transportation priority of the Seacoast MPO, that they concur with the range of alternatives being carried forward, and that the focus of the study is the Little Bay Bridges. In recognition of limited funds and fiscally constrained times, the SRPC believes the project must focus on Purpose and Need, and build flexibility into the design solutions so that future improvements by the state and others can be accommodated. While the SRPC supports employer-based TDM programs and suggests the need to allocate mitigation funds, they believe that HOV alternatives are infeasible for the 2025 design year due to the compactness of the study area and insufficient ridership. They suggest building flexibility into the current design solutions so that future conversion to an HOV alternative beyond 2025 may be possible. The SRPC supports expansion of the Downeaster rail service (Dover-Boston) and notes the difference in construction cost estimates developed by the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority – NNEPRA (\$1.2M) and VHB (\$9.9M) for adding one additional daily peak period trip between Dover and Boston. Frank explained that the difference in cost was due to equipment – VHB assumed that a new train set would need to be purchased, while NNEPRA assumes that equipment is available (at no additional cost) from AMTRAK under NNEPRA's current agreement with AMTRAK. SRPC also supports the bus alternatives under consideration and notes that reduced headways will maximize ridership. With respect to bicycle and pedestrian mobility, the SRPC notes that the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) serves to provide system connectivity and that system connectivity needs to be preserved. The commission suggests studying bicycle infrastructure improvements which fall outside of the Newington-Dover study area; Frank noted that consideration of such bicycle improvements as part of the project would be confined to the study area. Lastly, SRPC supports the rehabilitation of the GSB, citing the benefits of system redundancy, bicycle and pedestrian system connectivity, peak period transit use during construction of the LBB and the potential of GSB use as part of a local transit route around Great Bay. The SRPC also notes that, with respect to pedestrian and bicycle system connectivity, the GSB will provide a more pleasant and appealing experience for the pedestrian and bicyclist, in comparison to alternatives which remove the GSB, and attach a multi-use path adjacent to the rehabilitated and widened LBB.

Frank then summarized the comments from the City of Dover. He began by referring to Exit 6, and comparing the diamond northbound interchange, as proposed in Alternative 3, with a 2-lane loop ramp which the City has offered for consideration as a free-flow alternative to the signalized

diamond. He noted that the diamond alternative provides a relatively high (LOS "C") level-of-service with the traffic signal operations providing gaps within the traffic stream on the Turnpike overpass that will make it easier for traffic to exit Dover Point Road and Spur Road in contrast to the free-flow, 2-lane ramp condition. He stated that the project team still has reservations with respect to driver comfort and safety while negotiating the 2-lane ramp (particularly when adjacent to tractor trailers), and noted that the loop ramp necessitates a wider and longer bridge over the Turnpike which increases construction costs by at least \$2M in comparison to the diamond interchange. The free-flow of traffic at the northbound interchange will not introduce gaps in the traffic stream – in contrast to the signalized diamond interchange – which will make it more difficult for local traffic to exit Dover Point Road and Spur Road. Frank noted that he would present traffic model simulations of both the signalized diamond and 2-lane loop ramp concepts at Exit 6 later in the meeting. The City of Dover cited the potential need for sound barriers as neighborhood mitigation. Frank responded that a noise analysis is included as part of the study, and where sound levels are estimated to exceed FHWA thresholds for noise abatement, noise mitigation will be proposed. This element of the study is awaiting refinement of alternatives and has yet to be done. The City is also concerned over the location and alignment of the proposed grade-separated roadway which traverses under the Turnpike and connects the west and east sides of Hilton Park, and the potential impact of the connector roadway on Hilton Park. The City prefers a connection location as close to the channel as possible, while minimizing impacts to the park. Frank referred to a number of slides depicting Hilton Park connector alternatives. One alternative locates the connector roadway approximately 1200' north of the channel (STA 621+75), assumes the rehabilitation of the GSB, would cost approximately \$4.2M, would minimize impacts to the park, and requires maintaining a raised profile of the Turnpike between the LBB and the connector/underpass. Two other alternatives locate the connector roadway in proximity to the channel. One assumes the rehabilitation of the GSB (STA. 611+00) and involves extending the LBB by 100' and the GSB by approximately 162' to allow the connector roadway to pass under the bridges. Construction cost would be approximately \$9.7M (\$5.5M more than the northerly alternative) due principally to the additional bridge and local roadway construction. The additional area created under the bridge would be less than the estimated impact on the park due to the local roadway connections. This area, which has been suggested to be used as potential parkland, will have a vertical clearance of approximately 15 feet. The other alternative that provides the local roadway connector adjacent to the channel assumes the off-line new signature bridge and removal of the GSB (STA. 610+75). This alternative would extend the new signature bridge by approximately 100', require approximately 1,000' of retaining wall to minimize impact to park land, and cost approximately \$7.4M (\$3.2M more than the northerly alternative). Frank noted that the off-line, signature bridge resulted in greater property impacts (an estimated taking of 10 structures) in Dover than the on-line rehabilitation/widening alternatives (an estimated taking of 3 buildings).

Frank then referred to a graphic in identifying a number of Newington-related issues that the City raised. Alternatives 10, 11 and 12 have a number of common elements: provision of a local traffic connection between Nimble Hill Road and Woodbury Avenue/Exit 3, improved industrial traffic connection to Exit 3, planning for the perpetuation of the existing railroad right-of-way connection between the Newington Branch and the Pease Tradeport, and a new roadway connection between the Tradeport and Exit 3. The City raised the question of whether or not these design elements of the Newington alternatives support the project purpose and need. Frank responded that there was a rational nexus to the project purpose and need, given the aforementioned design elements would improve either safety or transportation efficiency, or both, within the study. For example, improved local connection allows local residents and employees to avoid using the Turnpike as a local connection between Exits 3 and 4 (in contrast to existing traffic conditions which require such use of Turnpike); potential movement of goods by rail as opposed to truck would improve efficiency and air quality; and providing a second turnpike access (at Exit 3) to the Tradeport will extend the life of the Exit 1 interchange (Gosling Road/Pease Boulevard) by reducing the Tradeport-related travel at Exit 1.

With respect to passenger rail and bus transit, the City of Dover supports the expansion of the Downeaster service between Dover and Boston (Rail Alternative 1A in the Rationale Report), and generally supports the transit alternatives being carried forward for further study, noting that reduced headways will maximize potential ridership. The City does not support HOV and Borrow Lane alternatives due to the insufficient ridership demand for HOV's, and the additional cost, maintenance and operations associated with borrow or zipper lanes. The City questions the warrant for a traffic signal at the Dover Point Road intersection located just to the east of the northbound diamond interchange depicted in Alternative 3. Frank responded that final design refinements would determine the appropriateness of the signal operations. The project team is concerned with the safety of residents entering and exiting Dover Point Road. Traffic gaps provided by traffic signal operations at the diamond interchange may be sufficient such that the additional signal at Dover Point Road is unnecessary. Finally, the City noted the need for signage along Boston Harbor Road directing drivers [assuming the existing ramp from Boston Harbor Road to the southbound Turnpike on-ramp is closed under implementation of a TSM improvement recommendation] to enter the southbound on-ramp from US4; the City also questions the need to close the ramp. Frank responded that this TSM improvement plan is still under review and stated that there will be a future public information meeting prior to finalizing the plan and programming its implementation.

At this point, Frank paused for comments and questions pertaining to his summary of review comments on the Rationale Report. Chris Waszczuk noted that the PDA had previously commented on the importance of retaining the rail right-of-way as regards to redevelopment at the Tradeport, and as reflected in the 1995 update of the Tradeport's Development Plan. Chris distributed a copy of a letter from the Pease Facilities Director to the ATF committee. He explained that the letter notes the rationale for the rail corridor preservation and includes excerpts of the Pease Development Plan Update that are relevant to rail access. Maria Stowell added that the 1995 update to the Development Plan was mandated by the state legislature, and that any deviation from the plan would require legislature approval.

Bruce Woodruff had several comments. With respect to transit, he stated that the General Sullivan Bridge could potentially serve the proposed COAST express service scheduled for 2006, and noted the problem connecting northbound to the Turnpike in Dover after crossing the GSB. He suggested buses could utilize the current one-way connection between the LBB & GSB that flows easterly beneath the LBB and leads to Exit 5. He suggested a need for a master plan for Hilton Park that would reflect how pedestrians, bicycle and vehicle connections could be accommodated while minimizing impacts to the Park. He noted that providing the local roadway connector to the north of the channel (STA. 621+75) results in retaining walls to maintain the elevated profile of the Turnpike to traverse over the local roadway. He suggested that a combination of elevating the Turnpike and lowering the grade of the connector road may be necessary to minimize the effect on Dover Point. Chris Waszczuk concurred with regards to the Turnpike profile impacts and noted that using as low of a grade as possible for the connector road will be investigated. He added that the pedestrian and bicycle connection could be provided adjacent to the channel – as it is today – assuming that the roadway connector is located to the north of the channel. Chris explained that during construction of the LBB, the area between the LBB & GSB will be consumed by the LBB widening and buses will not be able to traverse through the area to gain access to Exit 5 and proceed northbound on the Turnpike. In the event that the GSB is identified for rehabilitation and used by buses during construction, NB access to the Turnpike will need to be provided by the concurrent construction of the Exit 6 Interchange with the GSB rehabilitation. With respect to the local design elements of the Newington alternatives, Bruce stated that local connections should be secondary to addressing the bridge related issues. Chris Cross added that potential property costs associated with the local connections could be significant, depending on location and alignment.

John Scruton asked if the bridges could be extended to the state motor vehicle building located to the north in an attempt to avoid impacting Hilton Park. Chris Waszczuk responded that such a proposal was similar to a double-decker bridge alternative that was dismissed early on due to its extraordinary cost, and its unpleasant and unsightly appearance.

John Scruton commented that the relatively high density of current traffic flows contributed to the potential for fender-bender type accidents, and that response to study area incidents is constrained by the narrowness of the bridges. Bob Landman stated his concurrence with EPA's concern with future peak hour operations at the Dover toll facility. In his view, the toll facility should be part of the study, and that relocation of the toll facility to the Little Bay Bridges would address the issue of toll diversion by area travelers. Chris Waszczuk responded that tolls are a state legislative issue, not a project specific element, and cannot be allowed to handcuff the progress of this important project. VHB has analyzed toll plaza operations and found them to be satisfactory beyond 2025 with implementation of EZ Pass. He added that Frank would address future toll operations later in the meeting agenda.

Bob Landman noted that new park and ride locations, as recommended in the Rationale Report, need to avoid unintended consequences, such as free long term parking at the Portsmouth Transportation Center. It appears to him that some business and vacation travelers are parking at the PTC, taking the C&J bus to Logan International Airport, and traveling for extended periods of time. In his view, there should be no overnight parking at any state funded park and ride facility. Lloyd Melanson inquired as to the study area locations that were monitored for noise. He noted that southbound travel is noisier than northbound travel. Chris Waszczuk responded that study area locations that were measured for noise to construct and calibrate a model for estimating future noise levels are located on a plan contained in the Scoping Report. He asked Marc Laurin, NHDOT to follow-up and provide Mr. Melanson with a copy of the plan. Alice Briggs of Pomeroy Cove stated that she believes that the 2-lane loop ramp alternative for northbound exiting traffic at Exit 6 will be dangerous and noted the recent oil tanker truck that overturned on the existing loop ramp; she prefers the diamond-type interchange, and favors signal operation at the Dover Point Road intersection located to the east of the signalized diamond interchange since vehicles may have difficulty exiting lower Dover Point Road. Rick Everett questioned whether or not the City of Dover owned Hilton Park. He expressed concern with potential impact to Hilton Park and questioned why a connection from the east side of the park to Boston Harbor Road was necessary. Chris Waszczuk responded that Hilton Park is owned by the state (Bureau of Turnpikes), not the city, and that as a 4(f) resource, it is to be protected and, as such, impacts to the park are to be avoided if possible; if impacts are unavoidable they are to be minimized and mitigated. He noted that Exit 5 (the current access and egress to the park) would be discontinued in the future, and that a frontage road adjacent to Pomeroy Cove and connecting to Exit 6 was infeasible due to environmental and property impacts. As such, grade-separated connections under the Turnpike are being pursued as previously described and discussed. Alice Briggs questioned the necessity of providing the northbound on-ramp to the Turnpike at Exit 6. Chris Waszczuk responded that, while the on-ramp volume may be relatively low, constructing the on-ramp provided interchange system integrity at a relatively low cost.

There being no further questions or comments, Frank proceeded to show and describe a series of computer model simulations of 2025 peak hour traffic flow conditions along the Turnpike between Exits 3 and 6 under 6 and 8-lane Turnpike alternatives. This comparison clearly demonstrated the need for an auxiliary lane in each direction, in addition to 3 through lanes in each direction, to be carried between Exits 3 and 6 to accommodate the volume of traffic that enters and exits and changes lanes between Exits 3 and 6. These operations are critical southbound in the 2025 AM peak hour, and northbound in the 2025 PM peak hour. He also simulated and compared the northbound Exit 6 off-ramp 2025 PM peak hour operations under both the signalized-diamond and 2-lane loop ramp alternatives. As he had described previously under the review of Rationale Report review comments,

the diamond interchange off-ramp operations will be more than satisfactory (LOS "C") and the queuing of off-ramp vehicles will be contained to the off-ramp. The 2-lane loop ramp raises safety issues and involves additional bridge related costs (\$2M). In light of the peak hour operations under the signalized diamond interchange, Frank referred to the 2-lane loop ramp alternatives as a questionable solution in search of a problem. Frank concluded the review of traffic simulations by focusing on 2025 northbound PM peak hour operations at the Dover Toll plaza. Assuming implementation of the EZ Pass system, he compared operations under both the diamond and 2-lane loop ramp alternatives. Operations under the signalized diamond interchange alternative are satisfactory. However, due to the shorter distance of 4-lane storage between the Toll Plaza and the northbound on-ramp under the 2-lane loop ramp alternative in comparison to the signalized diamond alternative, vehicle queuing under the 2-lane loop ramp is significantly greater and will block the northbound entrance ramp to the Turnpike.

Based on review of the traffic model simulations, there was unanimous consensus on the need for 3 – through lanes and 1 – auxiliary lane in each direction extending between Exits 3 and 6 to safely and efficiently handle the 2025 travel demand. There being no questions or comments, Frank proceeded to discuss the profile of the Little Bay Bridges in the context of design criteria. He referred to a graphic depicting the existing profile of the LBB which corresponds to a 60 MPH design speed, and a 70 MPH design speed profile overlaid on the existing (60 MPH) profile. He noted that the 70 MPH profile provided slightly more stopping sight distance for the driver, and that the grades on the bridge would be approximately 3.3 percent in comparison to the 3.5 percent grades on the 60 MPH profile which corresponds to the existing profile. He stressed that the driver's sight distance associated with 60 MPH is not a safety deficiency, in comparison to the narrow shoulders (2'-0" to 2'-3") on the existing bridges which are safety deficiencies. He noted that the 60 MPH design speed is 10 MPH greater than the 50 MPH posted speed for the bridges and study area, and that the 50 MPH posted speed was appropriate for the study area. The Turnpike study area is a zone of transition where abutting land use is developed, interchange spacing is close, and there are relatively high volumes of traffic entering and exiting the Turnpike and changing lanes. Under these conditions, drivers expect reduced speeds, similar to comparable sections of urban roadways such as I-93 through Manchester and Concord, I-293 in Manchester and I-95 in Portsmouth and Kittery, Maine. The Little Bay Bridge rehabilitation/widening alternatives maintain the 60 MPH design speed profile, address the substandard shoulder deficiencies, improve the traffic weaving conditions which are prevalent on the existing approaches to the bridges, increase capacity on the Turnpike and bridges and have significantly less impacts to Hilton Park and property owners than widening alternatives to the west of the existing LBB that provide a 70 MPH design speed. In response to a question, Frank noted that under current PM peak hour condition, traffic flows freely northbound on the bridge constrained by the narrow shoulders and density of traffic, yet, at the same time, traffic congestion and long delays are prevalent from Exit 1 north to the bridge approach. This congestion and delay are due, not to the profile of the bridge, but due to the lack of auxiliary lanes to accommodate traffic entering, exiting and changing lanes.

Following Frank's presentation, Bob Landman stated that he concurred that the existing bridge profile is not the problem, and that improving traffic operations on the bridge approaches was important. Bruce Woodruff also agreed and said that he was convinced that the existing bridge profile is not a problem. Jack Newick observed that recent accidents southbound in Newington attest to the lack of adequate auxiliary lanes on the bridge approaches. Chris Waszczuk noted that it is NHDOT's position that the existing bridge profile is not a safety issue provided that the shoulder areas are improved and the bridge approaches are addressed as proposed.

There being no further discussion on the bridge profile and design criteria, Frank then addressed the concept of peak hour shoulder use as developed under 6-lane combined options. He noted that the objectives of utilizing a widened shoulder for travel during peak hours are to increase capacity,

minimize environmental and property impacts due to the reduced width of cross-section, and to reduce cost without compromising safety. He explained that inside (median) shoulder use was preferable to outside shoulder use to avoid conflicts between through traffic and traffic entering and exiting the Turnpike at interchange areas, and that outside shoulders are preferred by drivers for emergency stops, and by emergency responders to an incident. Use of the widened shoulder would be unrestricted, i.e., not restricted to HOV's. Frank explained that the ATF had previously expressed support for this 6-lane alternative, particularly in comparison to the borrow lane or zipper lane alternative which requires additional maintenance and operations costs. Recent experience of peak hour shoulder use around the country has been limited to the retrofitting of existing facilities to increase capacity in highly congested corridors. For the most part, these projects have been implemented as interim measures affording time to plan, design, fund and implement more permanent solutions, if feasible. Accident experience has been mixed. In some cases, the frequency of accidents slightly increased following the introduction and operation of peak shoulder use; in other cases, accident frequency actually decreased. Research suggests that proposals for peak hour shoulder use should be reviewed on a case by case basis, and consider such factors as inside vs. outside shoulder lane, length of shoulder use section of highway, width of shoulder and lateral distance between edge of shoulder and median barrier, average volume of peak hour traffic per lane, percentage of truck traffic, HOV vs. unrestricted use of the shoulder area, etc. That being said, FHWA is questioning the viability of peak hour shoulder use as a long term solution, and is currently conducting research and formulating an opinion as to whether or not they can support such an alternative for the long term. Frank concluded by stating that the peak hour shoulder use alternative, described as Option 10 under the 6-lane options and as supported by the ATF, may be infeasible given FHWA's current position.

Discussion then ensued regarding both the 8-lane and 6-lane combination alternatives. From the previous two ATF meetings, 8-lane Option 1 (widen/rehabilitate the LBB; remove GSB; no TDM and no Transit) and Option 4 (New Bridge off line; remove GSB; no TDM and no Transit) had been removed from further consideration. Chris Waszczuk suggested that Option 5 (New Bridge, remove GSB, TDM and Transit) also be removed from further consideration due to impacts, costs, and 4(f) considerations. The greater impacts of the off-line alignment were discussed earlier in the meeting; Chris added that given funding constraints and the fact that the profile of the existing bridge is not a safety deficiency, the NHDOT would not support a new signature bridge in light of additional costs and the prudence – related 4(f) issue of removing the General Sullivan Bridge. The ATF concurred with the dropping of Option 5, and continued discussing the remaining Options and the cost of rehabilitating the GSB. Chris Cross noted that the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) has no funding and is looking to NHDOT to fund the rehabilitation. Chris Waszczuk asked ATF members if they supported the idea of rehabilitating the GSB. He noted that the project team and ATF need to hear more from the communities on the GSB issue. In response to a question, Chris noted that the GSB rehabilitation cost would range from \$18M (for pedestrian/bicyclists) to \$21M (transit vehicles) and the net additional cost of GSB rehabilitation versus GSB removal and provision of a multi-use path as part of a widened and rehabilitated Little Bay Bridge is approximately \$8 - \$11M, depending on the loading requirements. Chris added that DHR is on record favoring preservation and rehabilitation of the GSB in place. Chris responded to some additional questions, noting that the multi-use path could not be suspended under a widened and rehabilitated LBB, due to the navigational requirement by the USCG that the existing vertical clearance (52' at mean low tide) above the channel be retained. He noted that lead paint removal is reflected in the GSB rehabilitation costs. Bob Landman noted that there would be future maintenance costs following rehabilitation. Chris concurred, but noted that the maintenance costs would be less if future use is restricted to pedestrians and bicyclists, but that the incremental rehabilitated cost (\$3M) for vehicular loads would provide bridge system redundancy which has merit vis-à-vis incident management and future transportation flexibility for the area.

Bruce Woodruff suggested that 8-lane Option 2 (Widen/Rehabilitate LBB, Remove GSB, TDM and Transit) and Option 3 (Widen/Rehabilitate LBB, Rehabilitate GSB, TDM and Transit) and 6-lane Option 10 (Peak Hour Shoulder Use, Widen/Rehabilitate LBB, Rehabilitate GSB, TDM and Transit) be carried forward and the GSB be rehabilitated to carry vehicular loadings. Chris Waszczuk responded that the 6-lane Option 6 (Widen/Rehabilitation LBB, Rehabilitate GSB, TDM and Transit) should also remain from an alternatives evaluation perspective, recognizing that, without auxiliary lanes, Option 6 will not adequately serve the 2025 travel demand. Bruce responded that despite FHWA's reservations, Option 10 should also be retained. Bob Landman suggested that if Option 10 is unacceptable to FHWA, Option 9 (Borrow/Zipper Lane, Widen/Rehabilitation of LBB, Rehabilitation of GSB, TDM and Transit) may be the only 6-lane option that is viable. While the ATF clearly favors Option 10 to Option 9, Frank O'Callaghan suggested that it would be premature, based on the analysis and evaluation to date, to dismiss Option 9. Chris Cross concurred. Chris Waszczuk suggested that the FHWA may also have reservations about Option 9 as a long-term solution, and suggested that FHWA be requested to review both Options 9 and 10. Bob Landman suggested that a video clip of zipper lane operations may be helpful in understanding the operational and maintenance issues related to the borrow lane concept.

Chris Waszczuk, in summarizing, noted that Options 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10 remain on the table, with the ATF awaiting FHWA comments on Options 9 and 10. Chris asked if there was any more public comment. Hearing none, he suggested scheduling public information meetings in each community during the week of May 16th. He questioned whether an Advisory Task Force meeting prior to the Informational meetings was necessary to discuss refinement of the alternatives. It was agreed to hold an ATF meeting on May 4th at the Newington Town Hall. Chris noted that another ATF meeting has been scheduled for June 29, 2005 to discuss the status of the indirect and cumulative impact analysis.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 PM.