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: See List

Date/Time: June 25, 2003
4:00 pm

Project No.: 51425

Place: Newington Town Hall

Re: Newington/Dover Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Meeting
#NHS-027-1(37)/#11238

Notes taken by: Peter Walker
Frank O'Callaghan

Chris Waszczuk opened the meeting by welcoming the attendees and introducing himself as Project Manager and representing the NHDOT, Bill O'Donnell representing FHWA, the lead federal agency, and Pete Walker and Frank O'Callaghan from VHB, consultant to the NHDOT. He reviewed the meeting agenda, reminded attendees of the handout package which includes copies of the PowerPoint slide presentation, study area maps and the project's purpose and need statement. He stated that the presentation would take approximately 60 minutes, and requested that attendees hold their questions and comments until the presentation was complete. Chris then explained the purpose of the Scoping Meeting: to confirm the project study area; to discuss the study framework and potential impacts that warrant study; to define a reasonable range of alternatives; and to receive public input.

Bill O'Donnell then described the FHWA role as the lead federal agency. Given the nature of the project and the eligibility for federal aid, FHWA would have federal oversight responsibility for preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in conformance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EIS will address social as well as economic and environmental impacts. Bill mentioned a number of federally regulated resources including: public parks, recreational areas, wildlife/waterfowl refuges, historic resources, wetlands, navigable waterways, floodplains, farm lands and air quality. He also identified a number of agencies requested to be federal and state cooperating agencies for the project, including: US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, NH Office of State Planning, NH Fish and Game Department, NH Division of Historical Resources, and NH Department of Environmental Services.

Frank O'Callaghan then discussed the project background. He referenced the Route 16 Corridor Protection Study (1998) and the Newington-Dover Spaulding Turnpike Feasibility Study (2000) which both identified the current and future need for traffic operational and safety improvements to the Turnpike between the Dover Tollbooth and Exit 1 (Gosling Road and Pease Boulevard) in Newington. He described the Turnpike corridor between the Dover Tollbooth and Exit 1 by referring to a number of aerial photographs. He stated that 1980 average daily traffic volume

(30,000) on the Little Bay Bridges had more than doubled (70,800) by 2002. The increase in reported study area traffic accidents was more dramatic – 957 accidents within the 1997-2001 five year period, as compared to 575 accidents during the 1992-1996 five year period. He summarized 1996 peak hour traffic conditions as capacity constrained at Exits 3 through 6 due to both traffic volumes and substandard roadway geometry. He then referred to a series of current – June 2003 – aerial photographs of weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic flows which demonstrated AM congestion north of Exit 4 (Nimble Hill Road), across the bridge and through the Exit 6 interchange area to the Dover Tollbooth. Due to a minor accident in the vicinity of Hilton Park during the PM peak hour, northbound traffic was constrained to a rolling queue of vehicles which stretched back across the Little Bay Bridges to Exit 3 (Woodbury Avenue) and beyond. In both AM and PM peak hours, traffic flowed freely north of the Dover Tollbooth.

Frank described an Interim Safety Plan that will improve traffic operations and safety conditions in the Exit 4 (Nimble Hill Road/River Road) area by eliminating a number of traffic weaving conflicts and improving on and off-ramp geometry. The interim plan was a short- term recommendation of the Spaulding Turnpike Feasibility Study, and is currently under design. Frank concluded with a summary of study area issues and opportunities – identified by previous studies, local officials, regional planning officials, Advisory Task Force Members, and residents – which will form the context within which a long- term smart transportation solution will evolve. Some of those issues and opportunities include: evaluation of Exit 2/Fox Run Road interchange operations; future access to the Pease Tradeport, including a rail connection; changes in land use such as redevelopment of the Newington drive-in theatre; substandard deceleration, acceleration and traffic weaving conditions at Exit 4; use of the Turnpike as a local service road to reverse direction; stormwater management and water quality; coastal wetlands and floodplain areas; marine habitat and ecology; bicycle and pedestrian system connectivity; Little Bay Bridges' related deficiencies such as lack of shoulders, vertical alignment which limits driver sight distance, and the need for seismic retrofitting; General Sullivan Bridge considerations which include future use, long term maintenance and historic issues; Hilton Park related issues such as access, connectivity and boat ramp expansion; potential noise mitigation for businesses and residents located along Boston Harbor Road and in proximity to Exit 6 and Dover Point Road; and the transportation system constraint of two lanes across the Scammell Bridge and along US Route 4.

Chris Waszczuk then discussed the project purpose to improve transportation efficiency and reduce safety problems along this 3.5 mile segment of the Turnpike. With respect to the need for improvements, he noted that the Turnpike was a major limited access highway, linking the seacoast region with I-95, Concord, the Lakes Region and the White Mountains. The Turnpike is a principal arterial and part of the designated National Highway System; it is a major route for commuters, commerce and tourists. Traffic volumes have grown from approximately 30,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 1980 to 70,000 vpd in 2001; traffic volume is projected to increase to approximately 100,000 vpd by 2025. The Turnpike currently is over capacity (level-of-service F) and is further characterized by substandard bridge and roadway geometry – bridge shoulder width and profile, and merge, diverge and weaving areas of Exits 3 through 6. Peak hour traffic congestion is severe and traffic accidents have substantially increased during the last 10 years. Due to the nature of the facilities in the area for which no other viable routes exist, crashes result in long delays. The Turnpike bisects residential, recreational and commercial areas and impedes connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. Chris also noted that the Little Bay Bridges were major structures which were not designed and constructed to current seismic Performance Category B requirements.

Chris concluded by noting that the proposed Turnpike improvement project was included in the State's Ten Year Transportation Improvement Program and is a long- term transportation priority of the Seacoast MPO. As regional development has occurred and traffic volume has grown along

the Turnpike, traffic operations have degraded resulting in increased vehicle delays, increased traffic accidents and potential loss of commerce.

Peter Walker then presented a summary of the project study area. He reviewed a map of the proposed study area, explaining that the EIS will consider information not only from the immediate vicinity of the highway but also from a corridor approximately one mile wide. Areas in Newington to be studied include portions of the Pease Tradeport, land accessed by Nimble Hill Road, as well as the industrial and commercial lands to the east of the Turnpike. In Dover, the study area includes the portion of Dover Point west to the Scammell Bridge, north to a point just south of the Dover Tolls, and east to include the residential neighborhoods south of Roberta Drive.

Mr. Walker also summarized the list of sensitive environmental issues that would be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement:

Natural Resources associated with the Great Bay Estuary

- ✓ Marine Habitat: All intertidal and submerged habitats in the vicinity of the existing bridges will be mapped with the assistance of the UNH Jackson Estuarine Laboratory.
- ✓ Coastal and Freshwater Wetlands and Wildlife Habitat: Will be mapped and evaluated in the field.
- ✓ Threatened and Endangered Species: Identified through coordination efforts with the NH Natural Heritage Inventory, the NH Fish and Game Department, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- ✓ Floodplains: Based on FEMA mapping supplemented as needed.
- ✓ Water Quality: Focus centered on stormwater impacts.

Other Environmental Issues

- ✓ Air Quality: Conduct a hotspot analysis for CO emissions.
- ✓ Noise: Take traffic modeling results to predict noise levels under build and no-build scenarios.
- ✓ Hazardous Materials: Inventory known contamination sites in the corridor.
- ✓ Visual Character: Consider how reconstruction might affect scenic character of the Little Bay area.
- ✓ Farmlands: Although not substantial active agriculture, prime farmlands are present.

Cultural and Social Resources

- ✓ Socio-economic effects: Can be direct or indirect/cumulative. To be modeled using the REMI model with RKG Associates assistance. Indirect effects analysis to include as many as 32 towns as depicted in socioeconomic study area map.
- ✓ Historic Architecture: Consider all structures greater than 50 years old to determine eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. General Sullivan Bridge is most conspicuous element. US Coast Guard has asked for Gen. Sullivan Bridge to be removed due to its hindrance on navigation.
- ✓ Archeological Resources: Study area to be surveyed for archeological sensitivity.
- ✓ Recreational Areas: Particular attention to public parks, etc. Hilton Park most obvious example, with boat launch and other recreational facilities.

Mr. Walker then turned the presentation over to Frank O'Callaghan, who provided a summary of the project alternatives. Frank enumerated a range of possible alternatives:

- No Build
- Transportation System Management (TSM) Improvements
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures

- Upgrade Corridor
- Combination of Above

The No Build Alternative is required to be analyzed as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and is essentially a continuation and perpetuation of existing conditions and shortcomings of the current transportation corridor. The existing infrastructure would be maintained without any improvements or changes in travel characteristics. As such, the No Build Alternative serves as a baseline condition for comparison with other alternatives.

TSM Improvements are typically low cost measures to reduce congestion and improve safety. They are generally limited by existing right-of-way and might include small- scale improvements such as constructing turning lanes at intersections, restriping lane uses or installing traffic signals or roundabouts to improve traffic control. Frank referred to the previously described Interim Safety Plan at Exit 4 in Newington as a larger scale TSM-type improvement which is being pursued.

TDM Measures focus on reducing the travel demand on the transportation highway corridor. Such measures could include: bus service, passenger rail service, park-and-ride facilities, ride sharing programs, telecommuting, parking restrictions, work hours management (such as shift staggering and flexible work hours), and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. The suitability and potential effectiveness of these measures to be effective in reducing travel demands along the Turnpike will be evaluated as part of the EIS.

With respect to upgrading the corridor, Frank stated that in light of the sensitive environmental resources within the study area, new corridor alternatives would not be considered. Little Bay Bridge alternatives could include:

- widening/rehabilitating the existing bridges to provide 3 or 4 lanes in each direction;
- rehabilitation of the existing bridges in concert with construction of a new bridge to collectively provide 3 or 4 lanes in each direction;
- replacement of the existing bridge with new bridges to provide 3 or 4 lanes in each direction.

General Sullivan Bridge alternatives could include:

- rehabilitation for local traffic;
- rehabilitation for only bicyclists and pedestrians;
- bridge replacement for local traffic and bicyclists and pedestrians;
- bridge removal.

Corridor Upgrade alternatives could also include widening of the Turnpike main line to provide 3 or 4 lanes in each direction and reconstruction of the interchanges. Frank concluded by stating that a Combination of Alternatives, i.e. TSM and TDM and Corridor Upgrade, may also be considered.

Chris Waszczuk then described the five (5) phases of the EIS framework and process:

Phase 1 – Project Scoping/Date Collection/Issue Identification
Phase 2 – Conceptual Alternative Development and Screening
Phase 3 – Preliminary Design/Impact Assessment/Draft EIS
Phase 4 – Public Hearing
Phase 5 – Final EIS

Current Phase 1 activities include:

- collection of data
- base mapping
- assessment of existing conditions
- identification of the affected environment and issues of concern
- establishment of the project purpose and need
- projection of future travel demands
- identification of a range of potential alternatives
- preparation of the Scoping Report document

Phase 2 activities will include:

- refinement and evaluation of potential alternatives
- screening of alternatives and development of a constraints matrix
- development of a reasonable range of alternatives
- preparation of the Rationale Report document

The elements of Phase 3 include:

- refinement and further development of reasonable alternatives
- assessment of impacts
- identification of a preferred alternative
- identification of mitigation
- preparation of the Draft EIS document

Phase 4 involves the Public Hearing process and includes:

- submittal of federal and state permit applications
- conducting the Joint Public Hearing (ACOE, FHWA, NHDOT and NHDES)
- preparation of the Report of the Commissioner
- issuance of the Special Committee Report

Phase 5 constitutes the Final EIS process and includes:

- confirmation of the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA)
- approval of the Mitigation Package
- preparation of the Final EIS document

Following the FEIS publication, Regulatory Agency permits are expected to be received; FHWA Record of Decision (ROD) issued; and the ACOE permit procured.

Chris then summarized the Project Schedule:

Phase 1: February 2003 – December 2003
Phase 2: January 2004 – August 2004
Phase 3: September 2004 – November 2005
Phase 4: February 2006 Public Hearing
Phase 5: March 2006 – December 2006
FHWA Record of Decision: March 2007
Final Design: March 2007 – October 2011
Construction: October 2008 – June 2014

He then reviewed the Public Participation process which includes an Advisory Task Force (ATF); Public Informational Meetings; meetings with the Resource Agencies; and a newsletter during each phase of the study. In addition, a project website – www.newington-dover.com to help disseminate information has been set up. The public hearing will also provide a formal avenue to offer public input. Chris noted that the next meeting of the ATF was scheduled for 6:30 PM, July 30, 2003 at Dover City Hall, and encouraged all in attendance to check out the project website. He stated that minutes of this evening's meeting as well as the PowerPoint presentation would be posted on the website.

Chris closed the presentation by identifying Bill O'Donnell, FHWA, Bill Hauser, NHDOT and himself as contacts for public feedback and information; and by thanking attendees for their attention and interest. He then opened the floor for questions and comments at approximately 5:10 PM.

Chris reviewed the meeting agenda, soliciting questions or comments on the meeting purpose, the role of the Federal Highway Administration, the project background, or the project Purpose and Need. No one in attendance had any questions or comments on those areas.

Two questions were asked regarding the study area:

John Burke, representing the City of Portsmouth, commented that there was on-going study to address the Portsmouth traffic circle and Route 1 Bypass. He inquired as to the coordination of the studies. He also pointed out that Woodbury Avenue runs parallel to the Turnpike and currently shares traffic demands with the Turnpike. Mr. Burke noted that the current study area does not include the Portsmouth section of Woodbury Avenue and questioned how the study could effectively evaluate alternatives without looking at Woodbury Avenue.

Chris Waszczuk replied that the EIS will, in fact, analyze a portion of the Woodbury Avenue. Frank O'Callaghan added that Woodbury Avenue would be studied from Exit 3 southeast to the Gosling Road intersection and that the study would identify traffic impacts at that intersection including the northwest Woodbury Avenue approach in Portsmouth. Frank also stated that the Portsmouth Traffic Circle study and the Newington-Dover study would utilize the same regional travel demand model in projecting future travel demands. John Burke commented that he felt that the study would benefit if it were expanded to assess Woodbury Avenue south from Gosling Road to Market Street Extension. He felt such an analysis would help the study better address the Purpose and Need for the project. Chris responded that NHDOT would take his request under consideration.

Tom Fargo, a member of the Project Advisory Task Force representing the Strafford Regional Planning Commission, asked why the study area was limited to the middle of the Scammell Bridge. He felt that limiting the study area in such a way would fail to recognize traffic constraints on the north side of the Scammell Bridge. In terms of the natural resources, the study area map implies that only half of the Bellamy River will be studied.

Chris Waszczuk replied that the study area is limited in this way because previous Hearings held for the Scammell Bridge project limited the bridge and approaching highway to a two-lane section. Therefore changes to the bridge are viewed as beyond the scope of the current project. Peter Walker added that since no changes to the Scammell Bridge were contemplated under the current project, no direct impacts to the Bellamy River were anticipated. Chris added that hydrodynamic modeling would allow extrapolation of data to other locations for tidal elevation impacts, if necessary.

Not hearing any further questions on the study area, Chris Waszczuk turned the discussion to the subject of sensitive environmental issues.

The first comment came from Barbara Ridolfi, resident of Dover Point. Mrs. Ridolfi asked when the local residents could expect to provide input on the planning of the project. She was concerned that the notification of the present meeting was not adequate, and stated that many residents of the area were unaware of the meeting. Chris Waszczuk replied that public involvement is a major emphasis of the NEPA process. He stressed that the Department is in the very beginning stage of the project and that there would be numerous public informational meetings over its duration. He also pointed out that there was opportunity for the public to obtain information through a project web site, including an area for public comment. Chris explained that there is a procedure for requesting one's name to be added to a project mailing list, ensuring that the Department will issue individual notification of future meetings.

In response, one attendee stated that he believed that everyone in the Dover Point area should be notified, and that the Department should be issuing a blanket notification to every property owner in the study area. He suggested that following the initial notice, responsibility for maintaining involvement would rest with the resident. Charles Garabdian asked why he was notified when others in his neighborhood were not. Chris Waszczuk replied that Mr. Garabdian had received a notice because he had specifically requested to be added to the project mailing list prior to the meeting.

Tom Morgan, Newington Town Planner, commented that the turnout for the scoping meeting was good, but suggested that the turnout would have been even better had the meeting been held in the evening. Chris Waszczuk replied that the meeting was scheduled at 4:00 PM because Scoping Meetings generally focus on a discussion with the resource agencies. The meeting was therefore scheduled in the late afternoon for the convenience of these public officials. Chris observed that all of the future public information meetings would be held in the evening so that they are more convenient for the public.

Cynthia Copeland of the Strafford Regional Planning Commission (SRPC) listed two concerns: The first related to the Purpose and Need that was distributed with the meeting handouts. Cynthia explained that the Purpose and Need does not address the aesthetics of the area or its environmental sensitivity. She suggested that the project area serves as a gateway to the lakes and mountains of New Hampshire and that should be reflected in the Purpose and Need Statement. As a second concern she explained that many in the communities to the north and west of the project area are concerned about the effects of this project, particularly as they may relate to changes in development pressures and travel patterns.

Chris Waszczuk asked Cynthia to send any ideas that she had for revising the Purpose and Need statement to him in writing. Chris introduced Jim Hicks of RKG Associates (an economist who is assisting with the study) and asked Jim to reply to Cynthia's concerns regarding the socio-economic effects on the project. Jim Hicks explained the basis for the socio-economic study, which would identify patterns of growth under both a No-Build scenario and under an improved roadway system. He explained that the economic model analysis would play into the decision as to which alternative was selected. Peter Walker further explained that the socio-economic study area had been recently expanded to include the four northern-most communities in the Seacoast MPO including New Durham, Middleton, Brookfield, and Wakefield in response to concerns expressed by the Strafford Planning Commission on this subject at the previous ATF meeting.

Brian Mazerski of the Office of State Planning (Coastal Program) commented that the Fish and Game Department is currently planning to change the boat ramp at Hilton Park. He suggested coordination with Fish and Game Department be undertaken with regard to this issue.

A resident of Dover Point Road explained that she was considering making improvements to her historic home and asked whether she should actually make the improvements or hold off until the study was completed. Chris Waszczuk pointed out that the project time line is extended out over several years and that a final decision on the preferred alternative and its property impacts will not occur for quite some time.

Rich Roach of the U S Army Corp of Engineers commented that many areas along the shoreline in the study area were actually filled wetlands. Rich requested that the Department undertake a study of the historic changes in the shoreline to identify possible areas for environmental restoration to mitigate for any wetland impacts.

A resident questioned why the Dover tollbooth is not included in the study since he observed many near and actual accidents as a result of the tollbooth.

Chris Waszczuk explained that there were several reasons for not including the Dover tollbooth in the current study. First, the Route 16 Corridor Study (which had been described earlier during the evening's presentation) predicted that the turnpike would operate at an acceptable Level of Service north of the tollbooth well into the future. Chris also pointed to the aerial photographs which had been viewed during Frank O'Callaghan's presentation as evidence that the highway operates in a free flowing condition north of the tollbooth even when portions of the Turnpike and Little Bay Bridges are extremely congested. Furthermore, Chris explained that the toll issues are a major statewide policy issue. He explained that a study, recently completed on the toll system,has indicated that the elimination of tolls would require an increase in the gasoline tax or another revenue source to offset the loss of toll revenue, and that the state legislature to date has not had the political will to eliminate the tolls.

Several residents replied that, in their opinion, the tollbooths are a major issue. One resident stated that as the tolls were raised in the past, more traffic was diverted onto Dover Point Road causing increased traffic concerns for their neighborhood. Chris Waszczuk replied that he understands that tolls are a major issue across the state. Dover is not the only community in the state that has to deal with the issue. Chris suggested that people who are interested in the issue attend the July 30th meeting of the Advisory Task Force. At that meeting, representatives from the Bureau of Turnpikes will be discussing the toll study and the issue of the tolls.

A resident asked whether loss of property value is considered in making a decision about the project and what, if any, compensation is available for property depreciation? Peter Walker replied that property owners are compensated fair market value for any property that is needed for new right-of-way and that the Department of Transportation has a program in place to assist property owners through that process. He explained that the study would measure the number of property takings, which will be a key element of the alternatives analysis. He stressed that direct property takings are certainly not the only variable upon which an alternative might be selected. It is, however, a consideration that is weighed heavily in the alternatives analysis. Chris added that, in his experience, as mobility increases due to infrastructure improvements, property values generally increase over the long term.

A local resident stated that the noise from the highway was a major issue and that, in his opinion, the tollbooths should be eliminated.

Charlene Weed, a resident of Dover Point, explained that her home is located next to the Seacoast Furniture Store. She asked whether her property is within the study area boundaries. Peter Walker replied that her property appeared to be within the study area.

Another resident inquired as to the deadline for submitting written comments and will written comments have the same weight as the verbal comments expressed at the Scoping meeting? Chris replied the written comments would receive equal weight and could be submitted during the next month or two.

Barbara Ridolfi asked Jim Hicks whether there was a property value below which a property taking is considered "insignificant."

Jim Hicks replied that no such threshold exists. Mr. Hicks explained that he had been involved in 10 to 12 previous environmental impact statements and stressed that, in his opinion, the Department of Transportation takes serious consideration of the property impacts of its project. In further reply, Frank O'Callaghan explained that the EIS is an exercise in balancing all of the various public benefits and environmental issues. The proposed alternative will need to minimize impact on the environment and local property owners. Mr. O'Callaghan stressed that in addition to meeting the project purpose and need, the proposed alternative would need to be practical, affordable, must meet the requirements of the regulatory agencies, and must also be supported by the community. Frank pointed out that the project would not go forward unless all five of those requirements were satisfied.

Barbara Ridolfi explained that the neighborhoods of South Dover on Dover Point had been thought of in the past as one of the prime areas in Dover. She explained that she was very concerned that over time this quality of life had been eroded by the highway and tollbooths. She explained that the highway has created noise problems and has detracted from the area's scenic quality.

Bill O'Donnell replied that in certain cases noise barriers or visual barriers might be erected to help mitigate for noise or negative visual effects. Charlie Hood with the Department's Bureau of Environment explained the analysis that the Department would conduct to evaluate noise impacts explaining that noise levels in the future under both the Build and No-Build Alternatives would be evaluated. If predicted noise levels exceed a 66-decibel threshold, then the appropriateness and cost-effectiveness of a noise barrier would be evaluated.

Dominic Ridolfi stated that he had already seen preliminary designs for the highway improvements. Yet the information provided by the Department today suggested that the design would not occur until Phase III of the project. He asked whether the design was already completed.

Chris Waszczuk replied that the design had not yet been initiated. The information that Mr. Ridolfi had seen was from the 2000 Feasibility Study. That study was conceptual in nature and did not account for detailed conditions in the field, nor did it contain a detailed environmental analysis. The EIS study will build upon the information contained in the Feasibility Study but would develop a much more in depth analysis of study area conditions and eventually develop its own set of alternatives and recommendations.

Mr. Ridolfi explained that his review of the Feasibility Study showed a new road through existing historic structures. He inquired about the process for historic preservation. Chris Waszczuk explained the Department's approach to historic preservation is to first avoid any impacts if possible. If impacts are unavoidable, they need to minimized and/or mitigated. NHDOT consults with the state historic preservation officer and others in the preservation community to decide on mitigation for any unavoidable impacts.

Barbara Ridolfi asked rhetorically which "team" she should join to have the most influence on the project: the historic preservationists, the environmentalists, or another "team."

Chris Waszczuk replied that she should stay involved in the issues that concern her most. Chris asked those in attendance whether they believed that there was a need for the project. The majority of the people in the room indicated that they agreed with project purpose and understood that the highway and bridges need to be upgraded.

An attendee commended the Department for the fine presentation. It obviously reflected a great deal of thought and hard work. She commented that the Department had provided a great deal of information and had provided handouts, which she found helpful.

Frank O'Callaghan encouraged all of those in attendance to stay involved in the project throughout its duration. He suggested that strong public involvement would result in a smart transportation solution.

A comment from the audience suggested that the Department would need to make better notification to encourage public involvement. The woman inquired as to whether the Department intended to notify all property owners in the future. Chris Waszczuk replied that it was impractical to provide individual notification to everyone in the project corridor, given the Department's limited resources. He suggested that anyone who wanted individual notification of future meetings request to be placed on the mailing list through the project web site or by contacting him. Mailing list members will be notified of future meetings at least one week in advance.

A resident inquired as to how one would sell property that might be affected by the project, given the current project status and uncertainty with respect to potential property impacts. Chris responded that, unfortunately, the affected properties would not be determined until the public hearing.

Hearing no further questions, Chris Waszczuk closed the meeting at approximately 6:15 PM.