



Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Six Bedford Farms Drive, Suite 607  
Bedford, New Hampshire 03110-6532  
Telephone 603 644-0888  
Fax 603 644-2385  
www.vhb.com

## Meeting Notes

Attendees: Chris Wellington – City of Manchester  
Bruce Thomas – City of Manchester  
Karen Keeler – Manchester Community College  
Carl Quiram – Town of Goffstown  
David Pierce – Town of Goffstown  
Tony Marts – Town of Goffstown  
Julie Chen – SNHPC  
Tim White – SNHPC  
Adam Hlasny – SNHPC  
Jamie Sikora – FHWA  
Leigh Levine - FHWA  
Keith Cota – NHDOT  
David Smith – NHDOT  
Mike Dugas – NHDOT  
Nancy Spaulding – NHDOT  
Marc Laurin - NHDOT  
Marty Kennedy – VHB  
Dale Abbott - VHB

Date/Time: December 4, 2012  
1:00 – 2:30 PM

Project No.: 52196.00

Place: Manchester Community College

Re: I-293 Exits 6 and 7  
Manchester #16099  
Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Notes taken by: Dale Abbott

---

Mr. Marty Kennedy of Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and stating that the purpose of today's meeting is to provide the Advisory Committee an advanced look and an opportunity to comment on the material/PowerPoint presentation that will be presented at next week's (December 12<sup>th</sup>) public meeting.

Mr. Kennedy made a point of reminding the Committee of the purpose of the study, which is to consider transportation system modifications aimed at addressing *capacity* and *safety* related deficiencies along the mainline and at the interchanges (Exits 6 and 7) for a 3-mile segment of I-293 including consideration of relocating and reconfiguring Exit 7 into a fully directional interchange. Mr. Kennedy asked the Committee members to continue to remind members of the public of the study purpose and how important it is to keep the study focused on the purpose.

Mr. Kennedy reviewed the PowerPoint presentation, which is a draft version of what will be presented on December 12th. Mr. Kennedy reviewed the study purpose, study area, list of TAC members, study website, schedule, meetings to-date, and recapped the problems, constraints & issues, and potential solutions that were raised at the September public workshop or through the website. He then proceeded to review potential near-term, long-term, and mid-term conceptual alternatives.

During the course of Mr. Kennedy's presentation, the following discussion occurred:

Mr. David Pierce commented that the concept for the Single Point Urban Interchange at Exit 6 looked like an expensive option.

Mr. Pierce commented on the graphics used in the presentation to illustrate how the mid-term options transition to long-term alternatives, and suggested that the mid-term and long-term improvement options be shown in different colors.

Mr. Tim White commented on the mid-term options at Exit 6, specifically the location of the slip ramps, and asked if the location of the slip ramps were within the existing turnpike ROW or on private property.

Mr. Kennedy replied that the alternatives shown on the graphics represent preliminary concepts and have not been engineered yet. Mr. Kennedy stated that none of the conceptual alternatives have been evaluated for impacts and that it is too early to determine any property impacts. Furthermore, Mr. Kennedy stated that the goal at this point is to present ideas and concepts. The evaluation will occur after the concepts are presented at December 12<sup>th</sup> public meeting.

Mr. Pierce suggested that during next week's presentation Mr. Kennedy stress that each alternative shown will be evaluated for capacity and safety.

Mr. White noted that the alternative for a full access interchange at the existing location of Exit 7 would not provide a connection to Goffstown Road.

Mr. Bruce Thomas followed-up on Mr. White's comment by adding that a full access interchange at the existing location may not address traffic diversion at Exit 6.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the evaluation will consider the extent to which each alternative redistributes traffic and/or enhances connectivity.

Mr. Pierce stated that given the way that the PowerPoint slides are arranged, he was expecting to see mid-term options at Exit 7.

Mr. Kennedy noted that he would look at rearranging the slides to eliminate the confusion, but that there were no proposed mid-term options for Exit 7.

Mr. White asked why the new full access interchange at the existing location of Exit 7 isn't considered a mid-term alternative.

Mr. Kennedy explained that reconstructing the Exit 7 interchange at its existing location is considered a long-term alternative because it's aimed at meeting the study purpose of addressing the capacity and safety deficiencies at Exit 7. Mid-term alternatives might only partially address the purpose, but might be considered as an interim measure in the event that funding or other limitations delay the implementation of a long-term alternative.

Mr. Pierce noted that we need to be careful to not spend substantial dollars on a mid-term solution that would need to be removed in as little as 10 years.

Mr. White stated that building a full access interchange at existing Exit 7, neither would address the long-term need for a connection to Goffstown Road nor would it reduce traffic at Exit 6.

Mr. Tony Marts asked if the purpose of the project is to address both Exits 6 and 7. Mr. Marts would be concerned if the focus of the solutions were only on Exit 6.

Mr. White stated that a relocated Exit 7 with a connection to Goffstown Road could also address issues at Exit 6.

Mr. David Smith noted that the reconstruction of Exits 6 and 7 may occur as two separate projects with separate timeframes.

Mr. Kennedy noted that our evaluation of alternatives would consider the possibility of the project being phased in that either Exit 6 or Exit 7 could be constructed prior to the other.

Mr. Marts asked if the evaluation would consider the implementation of mid-term improvements at Exit 6 and long-term improvements at Exit 7 or vice versa. Mr. Marts questioned whether sufficient funding would be available to implement the entire plan and asked if the study team needed to know what funding was available in order to conduct the analysis. Mr. Marts also asked if there are examples of other similar planning studies conducted by the NHDOT that he could review.

Mr. Kennedy replied that the evaluation would consider different combinations of alternatives including mid-term improvements in one location and long-term improvements in another. With regards to funding, Mr. Kennedy said that it is unlikely that we would know during the evaluation phase what level of funding will ultimately be available.

Mr. Kennedy explained that the goal is to identify the potential alternatives and then evaluate them for traffic, environmental, costs, etc., and when the evaluation is complete, the best alternatives will rise to the top.

Mr. Pierce commented on one of the earlier slides that Mr. Kennedy presented regarding the schedule and Phase 4. Mr. Pierce thought it was important that the public understand who will be reviewing the environmental documentation and what decisions those reviewers will be making.

Mr. Mike Dugas clarified that at the end of this phase of the project we will have a reasonable ranking of alternatives that have been narrowed down from a larger list of alternatives.

Mr. Dugas, responding to Mr. Marts question about a comparable planning study and suggested that Mr. Marts review the Newington-Dover project, which is a similar project that has advanced to construction.

With regard to the question on funding, Mr. Keith Cota stated that at this time funding has been made available for the Planning Study only. Mr. Cota noted that the Department will use the results of the Planning Study to have a discussion with partner agencies about funding further phases of the project. Mr. Cota noted that moving forward with a list of alternatives that can make it through the environmental documentation process in a timely manner is important in moving the project forward. Mr. Cota added that he believes that the resource agencies will want to see an alternative depicting a full access interchange at the existing location of Exit 7 included in the evaluation.

Mr. Cota also suggested that with regard to Mr. Marts request for examples of similar planning studies, that he consider reviewing the Bow/Concord project, which is a little more current than the Newington-Dover Bridge project.

Mr. Kennedy stated that both the Newington-Dover study and the Bow-Concord study can be found on the NHDOT website.

Mr. Thomas noted that there is a large wetland system between Dunbarton Road and Goffstown Road, which is not shown on the PowerPoint slide.

Mr. Kennedy stated that for the purpose of the public meeting, the goal is to have a relatively simple set of graphics, without a lot of resource information. The evaluation will consider all of the existing resource data that has been collected for the project. When the evaluation is complete the study team will present the results with a matrix, detailed graphics, charts, etc.

Mr. Thomas asked if the mid-term transition to long-term solutions graphic shown for Exit 6 was realistic. Mr. Thomas questioned the spacing that is shown for the two northbound on-ramps.

Mr. Kennedy replied that the alternative needs some more engineering to evaluate the ramp spacing.

Mr. Cota followed up by stating that it looks like from an engineering layout the alternative will work, but the concepts need to be further engineered to ensure proper slopes and other design elements. Some of the conceptual alternatives look neat on paper but they need to be tested against the engineering.

Mr. Marts asked when the alternative evaluation will begin and when preliminary results will be available.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the alternative evaluation will begin immediately following the public meeting. He anticipates monthly TAC meeting from January through March/April to present preliminary results to the TAC.

Mr. Cota asked Mr. Kennedy when the TAC would be getting back together and what information they will be reviewing.

Mr. Kennedy anticipated the next TAC meeting to be sometime in late January. The next couple of TAC meetings will be fairly informal in that the Study Team will be sharing with the Committee whatever level of information and material that is available from the on-going evaluation at the time of the meeting.

Mr. Jamie Sikora asked if the presentation for the December 12<sup>th</sup> public meeting will be made available to TAC members in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he would distribute a copy of the presentation within the next day or two.

Mr. Marc Laurin asked why the Merrimack River and other landmarks were not shown on the Exit 7 graphics.

Mr. Pierce noted that it would be helpful to add to the graphics as many labels for landmarks as possible.

Mr. Carl Quiram recommended adding a label for the Manchester Community College on the Exit 7 graphics.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he will add labels to the graphics, but that he wants to keep the graphics as simple as possible so as to keep the focus on the conceptual sketch.

Mr. Kennedy thanked the TAC for attending today's meeting and asked them to help spread the word about next week's public meeting. The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.